arXiv:1401.6529v1 [math-ph] 25 Jan 2014

ON THE CONVERGENCE OF AN ALGORITHM CONSTRUCTING THE NORMAL FORM FOR LOWER DIMENSIONAL ELLIPTIC TORI IN PLANETARY SYSTEMS

ANTONIO GIORGILLI
Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Milano, via Saldini 50, 20133 — Milano, Italy.

UGO LOCATELLI
Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Roma "Tor Vergata", Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 — Roma, Italy.

MARCO SANSOTTERA
Département de Mathématique & NAXYS, Université de Namur , Rempart de la Vierge 8, B-5000 — Namur, Belgium.

Abstract. We give a constructive proof of the existence of lower dimensional elliptic tori in nearly integrable Hamiltonian systems. In particular we adapt the classical Kolmogorov's normalization algorithm to the case of planetary systems, for which elliptic tori may be used as replacements of elliptic keplerian orbits in Lagrange-Laplace theory. With this paper we support with rigorous convergence estimates the semi-analytical work in our previous article [19], where an explicit calculation of an invariant torus for a planar model of the Sun-Jupiter-Saturn-Uranus system has been made. With respect to previous works on the same subject we exploit the characteristic of Lie series giving a precise control of all terms generated by our algorithm. This allows us to slightly relax the non-resonance conditions on the frequencies.

1. Introduction

Lower dimensional invariant tori in weakly perturbed Hamiltonian system, as opposed to periodic orbits and full dimensional tori, are a natural class of objects which deserve to be investigated. We are particularly interested in the existence of such invariant tori for the planetary problem. We refer in particular to the theory of secular motions originally developed by Lagrange and Laplace. In that theory one investigates the motion near to keplerian orbits, with inclinations and eccentricities equal to zero. We point out that in the neighborhood of these orbits there are elliptic invariant tori that may be used in order to generalize and hopefully improve the previous theory.

As a general fact, the existence of elliptic lower dimensional invariant tori was first stated by Melnikov[16] and, more than 20 years later, proved independently by

Eliasson[4] and Kuksin[12]. Their results have also been extended to Hamiltonian PDEs (see, again, [12], [17], [18] and, for more recent results, [1] and references therein).

Concerning the planetary problem, the existence of lower dimensional tori for the three-body system has been proven by Jefferys and Moser[10] and Lieberman[14]. However the configurations considered in those papers are quite far from the ones in the original Lagrange-Laplace theory. In [10] the case of large mutual inclinations is investigated, so that the lower dimensional tori are partially hyperbolic. In [14] the ratio of the semi-major axes of the planets is assumed to be small enough and the perihelia are locked in phase. An application of Pöschel's method to the Solar System has been produced by Biasco, Chierchia and Valdinoci in two different cases, namely the spatial three-body planetary problem and a planar system with a central star and n planets (see [2] and [3], respectively). However, as often happens in the framework of KAM theory, their approach is deep from a theoretical point of view, but seems not to be suitable for explicit calculations, even if one is just interested in finding the locations of an elliptic invariant torus.

A constructive algorithm for elliptic tori has been produced by the authors in a previous paper [19], where the formal procedure is described in detail. Furthermore an explicit calculation for a planar model of the Sun-Jupiter-Saturn-Uranus system has been performed using algebraic manipulation on a computer, and the resulting orbits on an elliptic torus have been found to be in agreement with those obtained by direct numerical integration. The construction of an elliptic torus is performed by giving the Hamiltonian a suitable normal form using an infinite sequence of near the identity canonical transformations defined by Lie series. However, a rigorous proof of the convergence of the whole procedure does not follow from previous ones, and is still lacking. In the present paper we publish such a proof.

From a technical point the main difference with respect to the previous works is that our algorithm is fully constructive, and specially designed to deal with the Hamiltonian of a planetary system. Moreover we transport in the KAM framework a non-resonance condition that has been introduced in [8] for the Poincaré-Siegel problem. Actually that condition turns out to be equivalent to the Bruno's one, but it produces better analytical estimates. The perturbation procedure is followed by a geometric argument concerning the estimate of the measure of a suitable set of non-resonant frequencies, which is basically an adaptation of the approach described in [17].

We state here our main result. Let us consider a $2(n_1 + n_2)$-dimensional phase space endowed with n_1 pairs of action-angle coordinates $(p, q) \in \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathbb{T}^{n_1}$ and other n_2 pairwise conjugated canonical variables $(x, y) \in \mathcal{O}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2n_2}$, where both $\mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ are open sets including the origin. We also introduce an open set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and the frequency vector $\omega^{(0)} \in \mathcal{U}$ which plays the role of a parameter.

Theorem 1: *Consider the following family of real Hamiltonians, parameterized by the*

n_1-dimensional frequency vector $\omega^{(0)}$,

$$\mathcal{H}^{(0)}(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)}) = \omega^{(0)}\cdot p + \varepsilon\sum_{j=1}^{n_2}\left[\frac{\Omega_j^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})}{2}\left(x_j^2+y_j^2\right)\right] + \varepsilon\mathcal{F}_0(q;\omega^{(0)}) \tag{1}$$
$$+\varepsilon\mathcal{F}_1(q,x,y;\omega^{(0)}) + \varepsilon\mathcal{F}_2(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)}) + \mathcal{F}_{\text{h.o.t.}}(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)})\ ,$$

with ε playing the usual role of small parameter. Let us assume that

(a) the frequencies $\Omega_j^{(0)} : \mathcal{U}\to\mathbb{R}$ are analytic functions of $\omega^{(0)}\in\mathcal{U}$; similarly $\mathcal{F}_0$, $\mathcal{F}_1$, $\mathcal{F}_2$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{h.o.t.}}$ are analytic functions of $(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)})\in\mathcal{O}_1\times\mathbb{T}^{n_1}\times\mathcal{O}_2\times\mathcal{U}$;

(b) one has $\Omega_i^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})\neq\Omega_j^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})$ for $\omega^{(0)}\in\mathcal{U}$ and $1\le i<j\le n_2$;

(c) the function $\mathcal{F}_0$ is independent of p and (x,y) ; $\mathcal{F}_1$ is independent of p and linear in (x,y) ; $\mathcal{F}_2$ is either linear in p or quadratic in (x,y) ; $\mathcal{F}_{\text{h.o.t.}}$ is of higher order in p and (x,y), i.e., $\mathcal{F}_{\text{h.o.t.}} = o\big(\|p\|+\|(x,y)\|^2\big)$;

(d) $\mathcal{F}_{\text{h.o.t.}}$ splits as $\mathcal{F}_{\text{h.o.t.}}(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)}) = \mathcal{F}_{\text{int}}(p;\omega^{(0)}) + \varepsilon\mathcal{F}_{\text{n.i.}}(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)})$; moreover, the average of $\mathcal{F}_2$ over the angles is equal to zero;

(e) $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ is invariant with respect to the θ-family of canonical diffeomorphisms

$$\big(p_1,\dots,p_{n_1},q_1,\dots,q_{n_1},x_1,\dots,x_{n_2},y_1,\dots,y_{n_2}\big)\mapsto$$
$$\big(p_1,\dots,p_{n_1},q_1+\vartheta,\dots,q_{n_1}+\vartheta,x_1\cos\vartheta+y_1\sin\vartheta,\dots,x_{n_2}\cos\vartheta+y_{n_2}\sin\vartheta,$$
$$y_1\cos\vartheta-x_1\sin\vartheta,\dots,y_{n_2}\cos\vartheta-x_{n_2}\sin\vartheta\big)$$

where $\vartheta\in\mathbb{T}$;

(f) one has

$$\sup_{(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)})\in\mathcal{O}_1\times\mathbb{T}^{n_1}\times\mathcal{O}_2\times\mathcal{U}}\big|\mathcal{F}_j(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)})\big|\le E\qquad\text{for } j=0,\,1,\,2\ ,$$
$$\sup_{(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)})\in\mathcal{O}_1\times\mathbb{T}^{n_1}\times\mathcal{O}_2\times\mathcal{U}}\big|\mathcal{F}_{\text{h.o.t.}}(p,q,x,y;\omega^{(0)})\big|\le E\ ,$$

for some $E>0$.

Then, there is a positive $\varepsilon^\star$ such that for $0\le\varepsilon<\varepsilon^\star$ the following statement holds true: there exists a non-resonant set $\mathcal{U}^{(\infty)}\subset\mathcal{U}$ of positive Lebesgue measure, such that for each $\omega^{(0)}\in\mathcal{U}^{(\infty)}$ there exists an analytic canonical transformation $(p,q,x,y) = \psi^{(\infty)}_{\omega^{(0)}}(P,Q,X,Y)$ leading the Hamiltonian in the normal form

$$\mathcal{H}^{(\infty)}(P,Q,X,Y;\omega^{(0)}) = \omega^{(\infty)}\cdot P + \varepsilon\sum_{j=1}^{n_2}\frac{\Omega_j^{(\infty)}\left(X_j^2+Y_j^2\right)}{2} + o\big(\|P\|+\|(X,Y)\|^2\big)\ ,$$

where $\omega^{(\infty)} = \omega^{(\infty)}(\omega^{(0)})$ and $\Omega^{(\infty)} = \Omega^{(\infty)}(\omega^{(0)})$.

The existence of an elliptic invariant torus is a straightforward consequence of the normal form above. Indeed the torus $P=0$, $X=Y=0$ is clearly invariant and elliptic, and carries a quasi-periodic motion with frequencies $\omega^{(\infty)}$. This is the natural adaptation of the original scheme of Kolmogorov.

Actually, we shall prove two more quantitative statements, i.e., propositions 1 and 2. Let us highlight some points related to the theorem above.

If $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2 = 0$ then the Hamiltonian (1) is clearly in normal form. Thus, we collect in $\mathcal{F}_0$, $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ all coupling terms that should be removed in order to prove that an elliptic torus, possibly with different frequencies, persists under the perturbation. The request that $\mathcal{F}_2$ has zero average is not restrictive.

A relevant characteristic of the Hamiltonians (1) is that setting $\varepsilon = 0$ one is left with the so-called "keplerian approximation", depending on the actions p only. This is very typical for the application of KAM theory to a planetary system. Furthermore, the frequencies of the oscillations transversal to an elliptic torus are $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ with respect to those related to the quasi-periodic motion on the invariant lower dimensional torus. Thus a natural distinction arises between the fast variables (p, q) and the slow *secular variables*, according to the common language in Celestial Mechanics. Hypothesis (e) turns out to be natural if one is interested in planetary systems. Actually, it means that $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ is invariant with respect to rotations around the direction of the total angular momentum. This symmetry is equivalent to assume the so-called "d'Alembert rules" in Celestial Mechanics. Let us emphasize that hypothesis (e) allows us to deal with both the *spatial* planetary problem, where $\Omega^{(0)}_{n_2}(\omega^{(0)}) = 0$, and the *planar* one. The previous mentioned papers by Biasco, Chierchia and Valdinoci are restricted either to the spatial three-body problem (after the reduction of the angular momentum) or to the planar case, because they also require that $\Omega^{(0)}_j(\omega^{(0)}) \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n_2$. Actually our proof can be modified by replacing (e) with the weaker assumption that $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ is invariant with respect to the diffeomorphism $(p, q_1, \ldots, q_{n_1}, x, y) \mapsto (p, q_1 + \pi, \ldots, q_{n_1} + \pi, -x, -y)$. This could be interesting in order to state a theorem that applies to a planetary system after the reduction of the angular momentum. In our opinion, a further modification of the proof could also cover the case of restricted problems with three or more bodies, where the symmetries are lost.

Let us highlight that our statement does not assume the usual non-degeneracy hypothesis on the p-dependence of the Hamiltonian, which is required in the classical framework of KAM-like theorems. Actually, we just use the non-degeneracy property of the keplerian approximation so as to *preliminarly* give the Hamiltonian the form (1).

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we recall the formal algorithm, also introducing the peculiar property that must be satisfied by the expansions of our Hamiltonians, so as to fit with the aforementioned d'Alembert rules. A full justification of the algorithm may be found in [19]. In section 3, we introduce some unavoidable analytical settings. In section 4 we produce the quantitative estimates that are necessary in order to prove the convergence. Most of these estimates are now standard matter, so we skip some calculations that may be easily reconstructed by the reader. Instead, a special emphasis is given to the control of small divisors, since this is new in KAM theory (see subsection 4.1). In section 5 we prove that our procedure applies to a set of initial frequencies of large measure. In this part we simplify the discussion by using the Diophantine condition. However this is legitimate, because our non-resonance conditions imply the Diophantine ones, so that the conclusion concerning the measure remains valid. Finally, in section 6, we give the proof of the theorem 1. An appendix containing the technical calculations is included at the end.

2. Formal algorithm

This section is devoted to the algorithm leading in normal form a Hamiltonian (1) of the family $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ that is parameterized with respect to the frequency vector $\omega^{(0)}$. Our constructive procedure is described here from a purely formal point of view, by including all the (sometimes tedious) formulæ that will be necessary to analyze the convergence of such an algorithm in the next sections. Let us recall that our procedure can be effectively implemented with the aid of manipulations made by computer algebra (see [19]). As a very minor difference with respect to [19], here we have found convenient to use the complex variables $z = (x + \mathbf{i}y)/\sqrt{2}$ in order to deal with the transversal directions with respect to the elliptic tori (as is usually done). One can immediately verify that the transformation $(p, q, z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z}) \mapsto (p, q, x, y)$ is canonical.

2.1 Initial settings and strategy of the formal algorithm

For some fixed positive integer K we introduce the classes of functions $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{m},\hat{l},sK}$ with integers $\hat{m}$, $\hat{l}$, $s \geq 0$, which can be written as

$$g(p, q, z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z}) = \sum_{\substack{m\in\mathbb{N}^{n_1}\\ |m|=\hat{m}}} \sum_{\substack{(l,\bar{l})\in\mathbb{N}^{2n_2}\\ |l|+|\bar{l}|=\hat{l}}} \sum_{\substack{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_1}\\ |k|\leq sK}} c_{m,l,\bar{l},k}\, p^m z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^{\bar{l}} \exp(\mathbf{i}k\cdot q)\ , \tag{2}$$

with coefficients $c_{m,l,\bar{l},k} \in \mathbb{C}$. Here we denote by $|\cdot|$ the l_1-norm and we adopt use the multi-index notation, i.e., $p^m = \prod_{j=1}^{n_1} p_j^{m_j}$.

Furthermore we say that $g \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$ in case

$$g \in \bigcup_{\substack{\hat{m}\geq 0\,,\,\hat{l}\geq 0\\ 2\hat{m}+\hat{l}=\ell}} \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{m},\hat{l},sK}$$

and the Taylor-Fourier expansion of g satisfies the following property: setting

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar{l}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2}(l_j - \bar{l}_j)\ , \qquad \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} k_j\ , \tag{3}$$

one has $c_{m,l,\bar{l},k} = 0$ for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar{l}) \neq \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)$. We also set $\mathcal{P}_{-2,sK} = \mathcal{P}_{-1,sK} = \{0\}$ for $s \geq 0$, $K > 0$.

The latter definition is equivalent to hypothesis (e) of theorem 1 and includes also the d'Alembert rules, mentioned in the introduction. In Celestial Mechanics these rules are usually stated by saying that all terms appearing in the expansions have the "monomial characteristic" $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar{l})$ equal to the "characteristic of the inequality" $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)$.

Finally we shall denote by $\langle g\rangle_\vartheta = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \mathrm{d}\vartheta_1 \ldots \mathrm{d}\vartheta_n\, g/(2\pi)^n$ the average of a function g with respect to the angles ϑ. We shall also omit the dependence of the function from the variables, unless it has some special meaning.

The relevant algebraic property is stated by the following

Lemma 1: *Let $g \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$ and $g' \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell',s'K}$ for some ℓ, s, ℓ', $s' \geq 0$ and $K > 0$. Then $\{g, g'\} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell+\ell'-2,(s+s')K}$.*

The proof of the lemma above is left to the reader being a straightforward consequence of the definition of the Poisson bracket.

We start with the Hamiltonian in the form

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(0)} &= \omega^{(0)} \cdot p + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \Omega_j^{(0)} z_j \bar{z}_j + \sum_{\ell>2} \sum_{s\geq 0} \varepsilon^s f_\ell^{(0,s)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s\geq 1} \varepsilon^s f_0^{(0,s)} + \sum_{s\geq 1} \varepsilon^s f_1^{(0,s)} + \sum_{s\geq 1} \varepsilon^s f_2^{(0,s)} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $f_\ell^{(0,s)} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$; moreover, as in hypothesis (c) of theorem 1, $f_\ell^{(0,0)} = f_\ell^{(0,0)}(p;\omega^{(0)})$ for $\ell \geq 3$ and $\langle f_2^{(0,1)} \rangle_q = 0$. The Hamiltonian (1) may be written in the form (4) (see section 3).

In the spirit of the original Kolmogorov's proof scheme, starting from $H^{(0)}$, we construct an infinite sequence of Hamiltonians $\left\{H^{(r)}\right\}_{r\geq 0}$ with the request that each $H^{(r)}$ is in normal form up to order r, in a sense to be defined below. To this aim, we perform a sequence of normalization steps, transforming the Hamiltonian $H^{(r-1)}$ into $H^{(r)}$ via a near the identity canonical transformation. The canonical transformation at order r is generated by a composition of four Lie series/transforms of the form

$$\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}} \circ \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_2^{(r)}}\right) \circ \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(r)}}\right) \circ \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_0^{(r)}}\right) \tag{5}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_g \cdot = \{\cdot, g\}$ is the Lie derivative operator and $\chi_0^{(r)}(q) \in \mathcal{P}_{0,rK}$, $\chi_1^{(r)}(q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) \in \mathcal{P}_{1,rK}$, $\chi_2^{(r)}(p,q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) \in \mathcal{P}_{2,rK}$. The Lie transform operator $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}}$, with a sequence of functions $\left\{\varepsilon^{j(r-1)}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;j)}(z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) \in \mathcal{P}_{2,0}\right\}_{j\geq 1}$ actually induces a canonical linear change of the coordinates $(z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z})$ (see subsection 2.4.1). Self-consistent introductions to the Lie series formalism can be found, e.g., in [9] and in [5].

The generating functions $\chi_0^{(r)}$, $\chi_1^{(r)}$, $\chi_2^{(r)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}$ are determined by some homological equations. The main difference with respect to the original Kolmogorov's algorithm is that the frequencies $\omega^{(r)}$ and $\Omega^{(r)}$ may change at every normalization step by a small quantity (see formulæ (35) and (36)).

In order to control the small divisors, we need to introduce at each r-th step two non-resonance conditions up to a finite order rK, namely

$$\min_{\substack{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_1}\,,\,0<|k|\leq rK \\ l\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_2}\,,\,0\leq|l|\leq 2}} \left|k\cdot\omega^{(r-1)}(\omega^{(0)}) + \varepsilon\, l\cdot\Omega^{(r-1)}(\omega^{(0)})\right| \geq a_r \ , \tag{6}$$

and

$$\min_{1\leq i<j\leq n_2} \left|\Omega_i^{(r-1)}(\omega^{(0)}) - \Omega_j^{(r-1)}(\omega^{(0)})\right| \geq b_r \ , \tag{7}$$

where $\{a_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ and $\{b_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ are two monotonically decreasing sequences such that $a_r \to 0$ and $b_r \to b_\infty > 0$ when $r \to +\infty$. For $|l| = 1, 2$ condition (6) is usually referred to as the first and second Melnikov condition, respectively, while for $|l| = 0$ it is the usual condition of strong non-resonance.

In the rest of this section we provide a detailed description of the generic r-th normalization step. Let us write the Hamiltonian $H^{(r-1)}$, which is in normal form up to order $r-1$, as

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{(r-1)} &= \omega^{(r-1)} \cdot p + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \Omega_j^{(r-1)} z_j \bar{z}_j + \sum_{\ell>2} \sum_{s\geq 0} \varepsilon^s f_\ell^{(r-1,s)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{s\geq r} \varepsilon^s f_0^{(r-1,s)} + \sum_{s\geq r} \varepsilon^s f_1^{(r-1,s)} + \sum_{s\geq r} \varepsilon^s f_2^{(r-1,s)} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{8}
$$

where $f_\ell^{(r-1,s)} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$; moreover, we have $f_\ell^{(r-1,0)} = f_\ell^{(r-1,0)}(p;\omega^{(0)})$ for $\ell \geq 3$ and, just for $r=1$, $\langle f_2^{(0,1)} \rangle_q = 0$. In the expansion above, the functions $f_\ell^{(r-1,s)}$ may depend analytically on ε, the relevant information being that they carry a common factor ε^s. Such an expansion is clearly not unique, but this is harmless.

2.2 First stage of the normalization step

Our aim is to remove the term $f_0^{(r-1,r)}$. Thus, we determine the generating function $\chi_0^{(r)}$ by solving the homological equation

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\chi_0^{(r)}} \left(\omega^{(r-1)} \cdot p \right) + f_0^{(r-1,r)} - \langle f_0^{(r-1,r)} \rangle_q = 0 \ . \tag{9}
$$

This equation admits a solution in view of the non-resonance condition (6) with $|l| = 0$. Indeed, considering the Taylor-Fourier expansion

$$
f_0^{(r-1,r)}(q) = \sum_{\substack{|k|\leq rK \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=0}} c_{0,0,0,k}^{(r-1)} \exp(\mathbf{i} k \cdot q) \tag{10}
$$

one can easily check that

$$
\chi_0^{(r)}(q) = \sum_{\substack{0<|k|\leq rK \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=0}} \frac{c_{0,0,0,k}^{(r-1)}}{\mathbf{i} k \cdot \omega^{(r-1)}} \exp(\mathbf{i} k \cdot q) \ . \tag{11}
$$

The new Hamiltonian is determined as the Lie series with generating function $\varepsilon^r \chi_0^{(r)}$, namely

$$
\begin{aligned}
H^{(\mathrm{I};r)} &= \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_0^{(r)}} \right) H^{(r-1)} \\
&= \omega^{(r-1)} \cdot p + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \Omega_j^{(r-1)} z_j \bar{z}_j + \sum_{\ell>2} \sum_{s\geq 0} \varepsilon^s f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{s\geq r} \varepsilon^s f_0^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)} + \sum_{s\geq r} \varepsilon^s f_1^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)} + \sum_{s\geq r} \varepsilon^s f_2^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{12}
$$

The functions $f_l^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)}$ are recursively defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_0^{(\mathrm{I};r,r)} &= 0 \ , \\
f_0^{(\mathrm{I};r,r+m)} &= f_0^{(r-1,r+m)} && \text{for } 0 < m < r \, , \\
f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r \rfloor} \frac{1}{j!} \mathcal{L}^j_{\chi_0^{(r)}} f_{\ell+2j}^{(r-1,s-jr)} && \text{for } \ell = 0 \, , \ s \geq 2r \ \text{ or } \ \ell = 1, \, 2 \, , \ s \geq r \\
& && \quad \text{or } \ \ell \geq 3 \, , \ s \geq 0 \ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{13}
$$

with $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$. The constant term $c^{(r-1)}_{0,0,0,0} = \langle f_0^{(r-1,r)} \rangle_q$ has been omitted.

2.3 Second stage of the normalization step

We now remove $f_1^{(\mathrm{I};r,r)}$ appearing in the expansion (12). To this aim, we determine a new generating function $\chi_1^{(r)}$ by solving the homological equation

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(r)}} \left(\omega^{(r-1)} \cdot p + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \Omega_j^{(r-1)} z_j \bar{z}_j \right) + f_1^{(\mathrm{I};r,r)} = 0 \ . \tag{14}
$$

Again, we consider the Taylor-Fourier expansion

$$
f_1^{(\mathrm{I};r,r)}(q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) = \sum_{|l|+|\bar{l}|=1} \sum_{\substack{0<|k|\leq rK \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar{l})}} c^{(\mathrm{I};r)}_{0,l,\bar{l},k} z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^{\bar{l}} \exp(\mathbf{i}k \cdot q) \ . \tag{15}
$$

where the average $\langle f_1^{(\mathrm{I};r,r)} \rangle_q$ is zero in view of the d'Alembert rules. In more detail, since each term appearing in expansion (15) must satisfy $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar{l}) = \pm 1$ (recall their definitions in (3)), then all the coefficients $c^{(\mathrm{I};r)}_{0,l,\bar{l},k}$ with even $|k|$ must be zero. The solution of the homological equation (14) is given by

$$
\chi_1^{(r)}(q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) = \sum_{|l|+|\bar{l}|=1} \sum_{\substack{0<|k|\leq rK \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar{l})}} \frac{c^{(\mathrm{I};r)}_{0,l,\bar{l},k} \, z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^{\bar{l}} \exp(\mathbf{i}k \cdot q)}{\mathbf{i}\big[k \cdot \omega^{(r-1)} + \varepsilon(l-\bar{l}) \cdot \Omega^{(r-1)}\big]} \ , \tag{16}
$$

where the divisors cannot vanish in view of condition (6) with $|l| = 1$.

We emphasize that the condition $\Omega_j^{(0)} \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n_2$, which has been required in previous theorems, is not requested here thanks to the d'Alembert rules.

Again, the new Hamiltonian is calculated as

$$
H^{(\mathrm{II};r)} = \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(r)}} \right) H^{(\mathrm{I};r)} \ , \tag{17}
$$

and may be given the form (12), replacing the upper index I by II, with

(18)
$$
\begin{aligned}
f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)} &= 0 && \text{for } \ell = 0,1\,,\\
f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,r+m)} &= f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,r+m)} && \text{for } \ell = 0,1\,,\ 0<m<r\,,\\
f_0^{(\mathrm{II};r,2r)} &= f_0^{(\mathrm{I};r,2r)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(r)}} f_1^{(\mathrm{I};r,r)}\ , &&\\
f_0^{(\mathrm{II};r,2r+m)} &= f_0^{(\mathrm{I};r,2r+m)} + \mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(r)}} f_1^{(\mathrm{I};r,r+m)} && \text{for } 0<m<r\,,\\
f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,s)} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor} \frac{1}{j!}\mathcal{L}^j_{\chi_1^{(r)}} f_{\ell+j}^{(\mathrm{I};r,s-jr)} && \text{for } \ell=0\,,\ s\geq 3r \ \text{ or } \ \ell=1\,,\ s\geq 2r\\
&&& \quad \text{or } \ \ell=2\,,\ s\geq r \ \text{ or } \ \ell\geq 3\,,\ s\geq 0\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

2.4 Third stage of the normalization step

In order to remove $f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)}$ we proceed in two steps. First we remove the q-dependent part and then, in the next section, the average one.

We determine the generating function $\chi_2^{(r)}$ by solving the homological equation

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\chi_2^{(r)}}\left(\omega^{(r-1)}\cdot p + \varepsilon\sum_{j=1}^{n_2}\Omega_j^{(r-1)} z_j\bar z_j\right) + f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)} - \langle f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)}\rangle_q = 0\ . \tag{19}
$$

Again, considering the Taylor-Fourier expansion

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)}(p,q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar z) = &\sum_{|m|=1}\ \sum_{\substack{|k|\leq rK\\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=0}} c^{(\mathrm{II};r)}_{m,0,0,k} p^m \exp(\mathbf{i}k\cdot q)\\
&+ \sum_{|l|+|\bar l|=2}\ \sum_{\substack{|k|\leq rK\\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar l)}} c^{(\mathrm{II};r)}_{0,l,\bar l,k} z^l(\mathbf{i}\bar z)^{\bar l}\exp(\mathbf{i}k\cdot q)\ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{20}
$$

one can easily check that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\chi_2^{(r)}(p,q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar z) = &\sum_{|m|=1}\ \sum_{\substack{0<|k|\leq rK\\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=0}} \frac{c^{(\mathrm{II};r)}_{m,0,0,k} p^m\exp(\mathbf{i}k\cdot q)}{\mathbf{i}k\cdot\omega^{(r-1)}}\\
&+ \sum_{|l|+|\bar l|=2}\ \sum_{\substack{0<|k|\leq rK\\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}(k)=\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{M}}(l,\bar l)}} \frac{c^{(\mathrm{II};r)}_{0,l,\bar l,k} z^l(\mathbf{i}\bar z)^{\bar l}\exp(\mathbf{i}k\cdot q)}{\mathbf{i}\big[k\cdot\omega^{(r-1)} + \varepsilon(l-\bar l)\cdot\Omega^{(r-1)}\big]}\ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{21}
$$

where the divisors cannot vanish in view of condition (6) with $|l| = 0,\ 2$.

The transformed Hamiltonian is calculated as

$$
H^{(\mathrm{III};r)} = \exp\left(\varepsilon^r\mathcal{L}_{\chi_2^{(r)}}\right) H^{(\mathrm{II};r)} \tag{22}
$$

and may be given the form (12), replacing the upper index I by III, with

(23)
$$
\begin{aligned}
f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,r)} &= 0 && \text{for } \ell = 0,1\,,\\
f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,s)} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor-1} \frac{1}{j!}\mathcal{L}^j_{\chi_2^{(r)}} f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,s-jr)} && \text{for } \ell = 0,1\,,\ s>r\,,\\
f_2^{(\mathrm{III};r,r)} &= \langle f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)}\rangle_q\ , &&\\
f_2^{(\mathrm{III};r,jr)} &= \frac{j-1}{j!}\mathcal{L}^{j-1}_{\chi_2^{(r)}} f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)} + \sum_{i=0}^{j-2}\frac{1}{i!}\mathcal{L}^i_{\chi_2^{(r)}} f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,(j-i)r)} && \text{for } j\geq 2\,,\\
f_2^{(\mathrm{III};r,jr+m)} &= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}\frac{1}{i!}\mathcal{L}^i_{\chi_2^{(r)}} f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,(j-i)r+m)} && \text{for } j\geq 1\,,\ 0<m<r\,,\\
f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,s)} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor} \frac{1}{j!}\mathcal{L}^j_{\chi_2^{(r)}} f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,s-jr)} && \text{for } \ell\geq 3\,,\ s\geq 0\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

2.4.1 Diagonalization of the quadratic normal form part in $(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$

The last term to deal with is

$$
\langle f_2^{(\mathrm{II};r,r)}\rangle_q = \sum_{|m|=1} c^{(\mathrm{II};r)}_{m,0,0,0} p^m + \sum_{|l|=|\bar{l}|=1} c^{(\mathrm{II};r)}_{0,l,\bar{l},0} z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^{\bar{l}}\ .
$$

We should remove the non diagonal terms in the latter expansion, namely the terms with $l \neq \bar{l}$. This could be done with standard algebraic methods. However, in order to construct a coherent scheme of estimates, we found it convenient to proceed with a Lie transform operator $\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}$, with a sequence of generating functions $\{\mathcal{X}_j\}_{j\geq 1}$. We recall that the Lie transform of a generic function g is defined as

$$
\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X} g = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_j\, g \qquad \text{with} \qquad \mathcal{E}_0\, g = g\ , \qquad \mathcal{E}_j\, g = \sum_{i=1}^{j}\frac{i}{j}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}_i}\mathcal{E}_{j-i}\, g\ . \tag{24}
$$

We look for a sequence of functions $\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)} = \left\{\varepsilon^{j(r-1)}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;j)}\right\}_{j\geq 1}$ such that

$$
\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}}\left(\varepsilon Z_0^{(r)}\right) + \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}}\left(\varepsilon^r g_1^{(r)}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty}\varepsilon^{j(r-1)+1} Z_j^{(r)}\ , \tag{25}
$$

where

$$
Z_0^{(r)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2}\Omega_j^{(r-1)} z_j\bar{z}_j\ , \qquad g_1^{(r)}(z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) = f_2^{(\mathrm{III};r,r)}(0,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) \tag{26}
$$

and $Z_j^{(r)}$, for $j \geq 1$, is the polynomial

$$Z_j^{(r)} = \sum_{|l|=1} c_{0,l,l,0}^{(r;j)} z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^l \ , \tag{27}$$

with coefficients $c_{0,l,l,0}^{(r;j)}$ to be found. The functions $\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;j)}$ are recursively defined so that

$$\mathcal{E}_j^{(r)} Z_0^{(r)} + \mathcal{E}_{j-1}^{(r)} g_1^{(r)} = Z_j^{(r)} \ . \tag{28}$$

The latter equation is solved by rearranging it as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;j)}} Z_0^{(r)} + \Psi_j^{(r)} = Z_j^{(r)} \ , \tag{29}$$

with

$$\Psi_j^{(r)} = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \left[\frac{i}{j} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;i)}} \left(Z_{j-i}^{(r)} - \mathcal{E}_{j-i-1}^{(r)} g_1^{(r)} \right) \right] + \mathcal{E}_{j-1}^{(r)} g_1^{(r)} \ . \tag{30}$$

Let us give some more details. Proceeding by induction, assume that $\Psi_j^{(r)} \in \mathcal{P}_{2,0}$ and depends only on $(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$; this is true for $j = 1$. Thus we can write

$$\Psi_j^{(r)} = \sum_{|l|=|\bar{l}|=1} c_{0,l,\bar{l},0}^{(r;j)} z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^{\bar{l}} \tag{31}$$

and the homological equation (29) is solved with

$$\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;j)} = \sum_{\substack{|l|=|\bar{l}|=1 \\ l \neq \bar{l}}} \frac{c_{0,l,\bar{l},0}^{(r;j)}}{\mathbf{i}(l-\bar{l}) \cdot \Omega^{(r-1)}} z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^{\bar{l}} \ , \tag{32}$$

where $Z_j^{(r)}$ has the form (27). The divisors cannot vanish in view of condition (7); the cases $|l| = 2$ or $|\bar{l}| = 2$ cannot occur in view of d'Alembert rules for terms independent of the angles q (see (3)). Again, let us emphasize that condition $\Omega_i^{(r)} \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n_2$ is not needed here. By lemma 1 all functions so constructed depend just on $(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$ and belong to $\mathcal{P}_{2,0}$. This ensures the formal consistency of the whole procedure.

Applying the Lie transform operator $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}}$ we finally get the Hamiltonian in normal form up to order r as

$$H^{(r)} = \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}} H^{(\mathrm{III};r)} \ . \tag{33}$$

The transformed Hamiltonian may be given the form (12), replacing $r-1$ with r, namely

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(r)} = \omega^{(r)} \cdot p + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \Omega_j^{(r)} z_j \bar{z}_j + \sum_{\ell>2} \sum_{s\geq 0} \varepsilon^s f_\ell^{(r,s)} \\ + \sum_{s\geq r+1} \varepsilon^s f_0^{(r,s)} + \sum_{s\geq r+1} \varepsilon^s f_1^{(r,s)} + \sum_{s\geq r+1} \varepsilon^s f_2^{(r,s)} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

possibly with a change of the frequencies $\omega^{(r)}$ and $\Omega^{(r)}$, that we briefly discuss in the next section.

2.4.2 Change of frequencies and transformed Hamiltonian

The key remark here is that the function $f_2^{(\mathrm{III};r,r)}$ still contains a part that is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^r)$ and belongs to $\mathcal{P}_{2,0}$, i.e., $\sum_{|m|=1} c^{(\mathrm{II};r)}_{m,0,0,0} p^m + \sum_{i\geq 1} \varepsilon^{i(r-1)} \sum_{|l|=1} c^{(r;i)}_{0,l,l,0} z^l (\mathbf{i}\bar{z})^l$. This kind of terms cannot be eliminated, then they must be added to the normal form part, producing small corrections of the frequencies so that

$$\omega_j^{(r)} = \omega_j^{(r-1)} + \varepsilon^r \frac{\partial f_2^{(\mathrm{III};r,r)}}{\partial p_j} \qquad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n_1 \tag{35}$$

and

$$\Omega_j^{(r)} = \Omega_j^{(r-1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \left[\varepsilon^{i(r-1)} \frac{\partial^2 Z_i^{(r)}}{\partial z_j \partial(\mathbf{i}\bar{z}_j)} \right] \qquad \text{for } j = 1, \ldots, n_2 \ . \tag{36}$$

Recalling that in view of lemma 1 each class $\mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$ is invariant under the action of the operator $\mathcal{E}_j^{(r)} = \sum_{i=1}^{j} \frac{i}{j} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;i)}} \mathcal{E}_{j-i}^{(r)}$ with $j \geq 1$, we get the explicit expressions

$$\begin{aligned} f_\ell^{(r,r)} &= 0 && \text{for } \ell = 0, 1, 2 \,, \\ f_\ell^{(r,0)} &= f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,0)} && \text{for } \ell \geq 3 \,, \\ f_\ell^{(r,s)} &= \sum_{j\geq 0} \varepsilon^{j(r-1)} \mathcal{E}_j^{(r)} f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,s)} && \text{for } 0 \leq \ell \leq 2 \,,\ s > r \\ & && \quad \text{or } \ \ell \geq 3 \,,\ s \geq 1 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Remark that the second equation means that $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,0)}$ remains unchanged under the whole normalization step, since one has $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,0)} = f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,0)} = f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,0)} = f_\ell^{(r-1,0)} = f_\ell^{(r-1,0)}(p;\omega^{(0)})$ for $\ell \geq 3$, recall equation (8) and formulæ (13), (18) and (23).

Let us stress that the first normalization step does not change the frequencies, namely

$$\omega^{(1)} = \omega^{(0)} \ , \qquad \Omega^{(1)} = \Omega^{(0)} \ . \tag{38}$$

This will play a main role in the quantitative scheme. Moreover it also remove a natural doubt about the convergence of the Lie series appearing in the definition (33) for $r = 1$, since it seems that the generating function does not get small when $\varepsilon \to 0$. Indeed, the Lie transform operator $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{D}_2^{(1)}}$ turns out to be equal to the identity in view of the assumption $\langle f_2^{(0,1)} \rangle_q = 0$. Actually we get the chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} f_2^{(\mathrm{III};1,1)} &= \langle f_2^{(\mathrm{II};1,1)} \rangle_q = \langle f_2^{(\mathrm{I};1,1)} \rangle_q + \langle \mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(1)}} f_3^{(\mathrm{I};1,0)} \rangle_q = \langle f_2^{(\mathrm{I};1,1)} \rangle_q = \\ &= \langle f_2^{(0,1)} \rangle_q + \langle \mathcal{L}_{\chi_0^{(1)}} f_4^{(0,0)} \rangle_q = \langle f_2^{(0,1)} \rangle_q = 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

This in view of the recursive formulæ (13), (18), (23) and taking into account that $\mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(1)}} f_3^{(\mathrm{I};1,0)} = \mathcal{L}_{\chi_0^{(1)}} f_4^{(0,0)} = 0$, as both the generating functions $\chi_0^{(1)}$ and $\chi_1^{(1)}$ have zero angular average, while $f_4^{(0,0)} \in \mathcal{P}_{4,0}$ and $f_3^{(\mathrm{I};1,0)} \in \mathcal{P}_{3,0}$ do not depend on the angles.

Finally, let us remark that the Hamiltonian $H^{(r)}$ in (34) has the same form of $H^{(r-1)}$, so that the induction step can be iterated provided the conditions (6) and (7) hold true with $r+1$ in place of r.

Let us emphasize that our formulation of the algorithm works both for real and complex Hamiltonians. This is useful because all the analytical estimates will be worked out in the framework of complex functions, as it is usual in perturbation theory. However, if the expansion (4) contains only real functions, then all terms of type $\omega^{(r)} \cdot p$, $\sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \Omega_j^{(r)} z_j \bar{z}_j$ and $f_\ell^{(r,s)}$ generated by the algorithm are real too, as easily checked.

3. Analytical Settings

We introduce the complex domains $\mathcal{D}_{\varrho,R,\sigma,h} = \mathcal{G}_\varrho \times \mathbb{T}^{n_1}_\sigma \times \mathcal{B}_R \times \mathcal{W}_h$, where $\mathcal{G}_\varrho \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ and $\mathcal{B}_R \subset \mathbb{C}^{n_2} \times \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ are open balls centered at the origin with radii ϱ and R, respectively, $\mathcal{W}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ while the subscripts σ and h denote the usual complex extensions[†] of real domains (see [5]).

Let us consider a generic analytic function $g : \mathcal{D}_{\varrho,R,\sigma,h} \to \mathbb{C}$,

$$g(p,q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z};\omega) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_1}} g_k(p,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z};\omega)\exp(\mathbf{i}k\cdot q)\ , \tag{40}$$

where $g_k : \mathcal{G}_\varrho \times \mathcal{B}_R \times \mathcal{W}_h \to \mathbb{C}$. We define the weighted Fourier norm

$$\|g\|_{\varrho,R,\sigma,h} = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_1}} \left|g_k\right|_{\varrho,R,h} \exp(|k|\sigma)\ ,$$

where

$$|g_k|_{\varrho,R,h} = \sup_{\substack{p\in\mathcal{G}_\varrho \\ (z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z})\in\mathcal{B}_R \\ \omega\in\mathcal{W}_h}} \left|g_k(p,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z};\omega)\right|\ . \tag{41}$$

It is also convenient to introduce the Lipschitz constant related to the Jacobian of the function $\Omega^{(0)} : \mathcal{W}_{h_0} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ as follows

$$\left|\frac{\partial\Omega^{(0)}}{\partial\omega^{(0)}}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}_{h_0}} = \sup_{\omega^{(0)}\in\mathcal{W}_{h_0}} \sup_{\substack{\beta\neq 0 \\ \beta+\omega^{(0)}\in\mathcal{W}_{h_0}}} \frac{\max_{1\le i\le n_2}\left|\Omega_i^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)}+\beta)-\Omega_i^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})\right|}{\max_{1\le j\le n_1}|\beta_j|}\ . \tag{42}$$

Let us remark that the dependence on the parameter ω plays no role in any of the following statements, so hereafter, we shorten the notation by ignoring the index ω. We are now ready to claim the following

---

[†] Precisely, $\mathcal{G}_\varrho = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1} : \max_{1\le j\le n_1}|z_j| < \varrho\}$, $\mathbb{T}^{n_1}_\sigma = \{q \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1} : \mathrm{Re}\, q_j \in \mathbb{T}, \max_{1\le j\le n_1}|\mathrm{Im}\, q_j| < \sigma\}$, $\mathcal{B}_R = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^{2n_2} : \max_{1\le j\le 2n_2}|z_j| < R\}$ and $\mathcal{W}_h = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^{n_1} : \exists\, \omega \in \mathcal{W},\ \max_{1\le j\le n_1}|z_j-\omega_j| < h\}$.

Lemma 2: *Let us assume the same hypotheses of theorem 1 over the family of Hamiltonians $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$. Then, there exist positive parameters ϱ, R, σ, h_0, γ, τ, $\bar{b}$, J_0, $\bar{E}$, a compact set $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and a positive integer value K such that the canonical change of coordinates $(p, q, z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z}) \mapsto (p, q, x, y)$ transforms $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ in the Hamiltonian $H^{(0)} : \mathcal{D}_{\varrho,R,\sigma} \times \mathcal{W}_{h_0} \to \mathbb{C}$ described by the expansion (4), where both $\Omega^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})$ and all the terms of type $f_\ell^{(0,s)}$ are real analytic functions of $\omega^{(0)} \in \mathcal{W}_{h_0}$. Moreover, the following properties are satisfied*

(a') the initial set $\mathcal{W}$ of frequencies is non-resonant up to the finite order $2K$, namely every $\omega^{(0)} \in \mathcal{W}$ satisfy

$$\min_{\substack{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_1}\,,\,0<|k|\le 2K\\ l\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_2}\,,\,0\le|l|\le 2}} \left|k\cdot\omega^{(0)} + \varepsilon\, l\cdot\Omega^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})\right| > \frac{2\gamma}{K^\tau}$$

and

$$\min_{1\le i<j\le n_2} \left|\Omega_i^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)}) - \Omega_j^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})\right| > 2\bar{b}\,;$$

(b') the Jacobian of $\Omega^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})$ is uniformly bounded in extended domain $\mathcal{W}_{h_0}$, namely $\left|\partial\Omega^{(0)}/\partial\omega^{(0)}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}_{h_0}} \le J_0 < \infty$;

(c') $f_\ell^{(0,s)} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$;

(d') $f_\ell^{(0,0)} = f_\ell^{(0,0)}(p;\omega^{(0)})$ for $\ell \ge 3$; moreover, $\langle f_2^{(0,1)}\rangle_q = 0$;

(e') the following upper bounds hold true

$$\left\|f_\ell^{(0,s)}\right\|_{\varrho,R,\sigma} \le \frac{\bar{E}}{2^\ell}\,.$$

We give a sketch of the proof, which is not too difficult. The Hamiltonians should be split in many terms such that their Taylor-Fourier expansions are finite. *For any fixed value of index ℓ*, standard arguments on the Fourier decay of the coefficients allow us to determine a suitable value of the parameters K and σ, such that the norms of the functions $f_\ell^{(0,s)}$ are bounded by the same constant for $s \ge 0$ (see, e.g., the proof of lemma 5.2 in [5]). Having fixed K, some classical Diophantine inequalities allow us to determine $\gamma > 0$, $\tau > n_1 - 1$, $h_0 > 0$ and a compact set $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{U}$ such that property (a') is satisfied (being $\mathcal{U}$ the initial set of frequency vectors $\omega^{(0)}$ appearing in the hypotheses of theorem 1). Point (b') is a straightforward consequence of the analyticity of $\Omega_j^{(0)}$ on the domain $\mathcal{U}$. Property (c') follows from hypothesis (e) of theorem 1 as discussed at the beginning of subsection 2.1. Moreover, (d') is an immediate consequence of hypotheses (c)–(d) of theorem 1. Finally, other basic arguments on the Taylor expansions of homogeneous polynomials allow us to choose suitable values of ϱ and R, such that the inequality at point (e') of lemma 2 is satisfied. For $\varepsilon < 1$ we have $\sum_{\ell\,,\,s} \varepsilon^s \|f_\ell^{(0,s)}\|_{\varrho,R,\sigma} \le 2\bar{E}/(1-\varepsilon)$; taking into account that the usual sup-norm is bounded by the weighted Fourier one (defined in (41)), this implies that the Hamiltonian $H^{(0)}$ is *analytic* in $\mathcal{D}_{\varrho,R,\sigma} \times \mathcal{W}_{h_0}$.

The algorithm described in section 2 clearly shows that we need some suitable estimates bounding the Lie series/transforms. Such estimates are provided by the following statements. In order to shorten the notation, hereafter, we will denote by $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$, being α any real positive number.

Lemma 3: *Let d and d' be real numbers such that $d > 0$, $d' \geq 0$ and $d + d' < 1$; let $\mathcal{X}$ and g be two analytic functions on $\mathcal{D}_{(1-d')(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$ having finite norms $\|\mathcal{X}\|_{1-d'}$ and $\|g\|_{1-d'}$, respectively. Then, for $j \geq 1$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{j!} \left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}}^{j} g \right\|_{1-d-d'} \leq \frac{1}{e^2} \left(\frac{2e}{\varrho\sigma} + \frac{e^2}{R^2} \right)^{j} \frac{1}{d^{2j}} \|\mathcal{X}\|_{1-d'}^{j} \|g\|_{1-d'} \ . \tag{43}$$

Actually, similar estimates to (43) are included in some previous papers of the authors. Nevertheless, a little additional work is needed in order to adapt them to the present context. The proof of lemma above is deferred to appendix A.1.

Lemma 4: *Let d and d' be real numbers such that $d > 0$, $d' \geq 0$ and $d + d' < 1$; let the functions Z_0, g and g' satisfy*

(i) $Z_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} \Xi_i z_i \bar{z}_i$ with $\min_{1 \leq i < j \leq n_2} \left| \Xi_i - \Xi_j \right| \geq \Xi^* > 0$;

(ii) $g' = g'(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$ is such that $g' \in \mathcal{P}_{2,0}$ and it is so small that

$$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{diag}}^{\star} = \left(\frac{2e^2}{d^2} + \frac{2^9}{(1-d')^2} \right) \frac{\|g'\|_{1-d'}}{\Xi^* R^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \ ;$$

(iii) g is an analytic function on $\mathcal{D}_{(1-d')(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$ with finite norm $\|g\|_{1-d'}$;

Then, there exist a sequence of generating functions $\{\mathcal{X}_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ such that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}} Z_0 + \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}} g' = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} Z_j$, where $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the Lie transform operator that has been introduced in (24) and the Taylor expansion of the "normal form terms" Z_j is of the same type as that of Z_0. Moreover, for $j \geq 1$, the following inequalities hold true:

$$\|\mathcal{E}_j\, g\|_{1-d-d'} \leq \left(\varepsilon_{\mathrm{diag}}^{\star}\right)^{j} \|g\|_{1-d'} \ , \qquad \|Z_j\|_{1-d'} \leq \left(\varepsilon_{\mathrm{diag}}^{\star}\right)^{j-1} \|g'\|_{1-d'} \ . \tag{44}$$

Again, the proof of lemma above is deferred to appendix A.1.

4. "Purely analytical" study of the normalization algorithm

In this section, we translate our formal algorithm into a recursive scheme of estimates on the norms of the functions involved in the normalization process.

4.1 Small divisors and selection rule

It is well known that the accumulation of the small divisors can prevent the convergence of any perturbative proof scheme, that is designed so as to ensure the existence of invariant tori for quasi-integrable systems. In the present subsection, we introduce the tools that will allow us to keep control of the accumulation of the small divisors. Here, we follow rather closely [8]; nevertheless, we think it is convenient to adapt that approach to the present context in a self-consistent way, because it is one of the most delicate points of the whole proof. The key of our argument is to focus our attention on the indexes corresponding to the small denominators, rather than their actual values.

Let $I = \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\}$ and $I' = \{j'_1, \ldots, j'_s\}$ be two sets of indexes with the same number s of elements. Let us introduce the following relation of partial ordering on those sets: we say that $I \lhd I'$ in case there is a permutation of the indexes such that the

relation $j_m \leq j'_m$ holds true for $m = 1, \ldots, s$. If two sets of indexes contain a different number of elements, first, we pad the shorter one with zeros and, then, we use the same way to compare them.

Definition 1: *For all integers $r \geq 0$ and $s > 0$, let us introduce the family of indexes sets*

$$\mathcal{J}_{r,s} = \left\{ I = \{j_1, \ldots, j_{s-1}\} \, : \, 0 \leq j_m \leq \min\{r, \lfloor s/2 \rfloor\} \, , \, I \lhd I^*_s \right\} \, , \tag{45}$$

where

$$I^*_s = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{s}{s} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{s}{s-1} \right\rfloor, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \right\rfloor \right\} \, . \tag{46}$$

In agreement with [8], sometimes we will refer to the condition $I \lhd I^*_s$ as the *selection rule* S. We are now ready to claim two technical lemmas, which will be useful in the following.

Lemma 5: *For the set of indexes $I^*_s = \{j_1, \ldots, j_s\}$ the following statements hold true:*
(i) the maximal index is $j_{\max} = \left\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \right\rfloor$;
(ii) for every $k \in \{1, \ldots, j_{\max}\}$ the index k appears exactly $\left\lfloor \frac{s}{k} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{s}{k+1} \right\rfloor$ times;
(iii) for $0 < r \leq s$ one has

$$\left(\{r\} \cup I^*_r \cup I^*_s \right) \lhd I^*_{r+s} \, .$$

Lemma 6: *For the sets of indexes $\mathcal{J}_{r,s}$ the following statements hold true:*
(i) $\mathcal{J}_{r,s} = \mathcal{J}_{\min\{r, \lfloor s/2 \rfloor\}, s}$;
(ii) $\mathcal{J}_{r-1,s} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{r,s}$;
(iii) if $I \in \mathcal{J}_{r-1,r}$ and $I' \in \mathcal{J}_{r,s}$, then $\left(\{\min\{r,s\}\} \cup I \cup I' \right) \in \mathcal{J}_{r,r+s}$.

The proofs of the two lemmas above are deferred to appendix A.2.

Now, we think it can be useful to describe the mechanism of accumulation of the small divisors in a rather informal way. Let us assume some initial upper bounds on the perturbing terms, like those at point (e') of lemma 2 and focus on the first normalization step. Looking at the Taylor-Fourier expansion (11) of the generating function $\chi^{(1)}_0$, it is well expected that the estimate of its norm is $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a_1)$, in view of the non-resonance condition (6). Of course, the recursive formula (13) propagate the factors $1/a_1$ to the upper bounds of the terms $f^{(\mathrm{I};1,s)}_\ell$ appearing in the expansion (12) of the Hamiltonian $H^{(\mathrm{I};1)}$. In particular, the third equation in formula (13) allows us to remark that the "most dangerous" terms in the estimate of $f^{(\mathrm{I};1,s)}_\ell$ are $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a^s_1)$ (when $\ell = 0$, $s \geq 2$ or $\ell \geq 1$, $s \geq 1$). Here, if there is a sum of some upper bounds containing different small divisors, "most dangerous" means that we just consider the smallest denominator (in agreement with the definition of partial ordering $\lhd$ among the sets of indexes). Since $f^{(\mathrm{I};1,1)}_1 = \mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a_1)$, from equations (14)–(16) and condition (6) it follows that the estimate of the norm of $\chi^{(1)}_1$ is $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a^2_1)$. The factors $1/a^2_1$ are newly propagated to the upper bounds on the terms $f^{(\mathrm{II};1,s)}_\ell$ by the recursive definition in (18). In particular, the estimate for $f^{(\mathrm{II};1,2)}_0$ is $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a^3_1)$, while it is $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a^{2s}_1)$ in the general case of $f^{(\mathrm{II};1,s)}_\ell$ when $\ell + s \geq 3$. At each normalization step, the generating function containing more

divisors is $\chi_2^{(r)}$, since $f_2^{(\mathrm{I};1,1)} = \mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a_1^2)$ from equations (19)–(21) and condition (6) it follows that an upper bound on $\chi_2^{(1)}$ is $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a_1^3)$. By analyzing the accumulation of the divisors due to the recursive definition in (23) as we already did for (13) and (18), we can claim that the upper bounds on the terms $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};1,s)}$ are $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a_1^{3s-3+\ell})$ for $0 \leq \ell \leq 2$, $s \geq 2$, while they are more simply $\mathcal{O}(\bar{E}/a_1^{3s-3})$ when $\ell \geq 3$, $s \geq 0$. As we will explain in the next subsection, the estimates of the Poisson bracket involving the generating function $\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}$ do not propagate any small divisors; therefore, we can roughly say that the estimate just stated about $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};1,s)}$ hold true also for $f_\ell^{(1,s)}$.

Let us continue to consider the accumulation of the small divisors in the estimates up to the generic r-th normalization step, in the same way as we did above for the first step; thus, let us imagine to unfold all the recursive inequalities necessary to provide an upper bound on the norm of the terms appearing in the expansion of $H^{(r)}$. In the following table we summarize all the relevant information about the set of indexes appearing in the denominators, due to the accumulation of the small divisors.

(47)

Function	conditions	set of indexes
$f_0^{(r,s)}$	$0 \leq r < s$	$\left(\mathcal{J}_{r,s}\right)^3$
$f_1^{(r,s)}$	$0 \leq r < s$	$\left(\mathcal{J}_{r,s}\right)^3 \cup \{r\}$
$f_2^{(r,s)}$	$0 \leq r < s$	$\left(\mathcal{J}_{r,s}\right)^3 \cup \left(\{r\}\right)^2$
$f_{\ell\geq 3}^{(r,s)}$	$r \geq 0\,,\ s \geq 1$	$\left(\mathcal{J}_{r,s} \cup \{\min\{r,s\}\}\right)^3$
$\chi_0^{(r)}$	$r \geq 1$	$\left(\mathcal{J}_{r-1,r}\right)^3 \cup \{r\}$
$\chi_1^{(r)}$	$r \geq 1$	$\left(\mathcal{J}_{r-1,r}\right)^3 \cup \left(\{r\}\right)^2$
$\chi_2^{(r)}$	$r \geq 1$	$\left(\mathcal{J}_{r-1,r} \cup \{r\}\right)^3$

With a little abuse of notation, in the table above we introduced a sort of power of a set so that, for instance, $(\mathcal{J}_{r,s})^3 = \mathcal{J}_{r,s} \cup \mathcal{J}_{r,s} \cup \mathcal{J}_{r,s}$. We think that the rules described in (47) are really the keystone of the whole proof; they are implicitly demonstrated in appendix A.3 (dealing with the proof of the main lemma of the "purely analytic" part) through some estimates involving the sequence $\{T_{r,s}\}_{r,s\geq 0}$ that will be introduced later. Let us emphasize that the discussion preceding the table in (47) can be translated in a formal proof of those rules for $r = 1$; moreover, a similar reasoning can be extended to the general case.

Let us recall that at each normalization step r we need to estimate multiple Poisson brackets and this requires to restrict the analyticity domain. Of course, the series taking into account all these restrictions must converge; therefore, the divisor d^{2j} appearing in lemma 3 must shrink to zero when $r \to \infty$. This is another possible source of divergence of the whole algorithm. Actually, the present discussion aims at introducing the tools that allow us to control the accumulation of the factors due to the restriction of the domains, in a simultaneous way to the small denominators arising from the solution of

the homological equations. Let us define the sequences $\{d_r\}_{r\geq 0}$ and $\{\delta_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ as

$$d_0 = 0 \ , \qquad d_r = d_{r-1} + 4\delta_r \ , \qquad \delta_r = \frac{3}{8\pi^2 r^2} \ . \tag{48}$$

At the r-th step of the algorithm, it is convenient to make a restriction δ_r of the domain for each of the four canonical transformations prescribed by the normalization procedure, so that the Hamiltonian $H^{(r)}$ will be analytic on $\mathcal{D}_{(1-d_r)(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$. Let us remark that $\lim_{r\to\infty} d_r = 1/4$ in view of the definition in (48); thus, the previous sequences of domains converge to a compact set whose interior is not empty.

In order to translate the accumulation rules for small divisors into quantitative estimates, it is useful to introduce the sequence of positive real numbers $T_{r,s}$ that are associated to the sets of indexes $\mathcal{J}_{r,s}$ so that

$$T_{0,s} = T_{s,0} = 1 \ \text{ for } s \geq 0 \ , \qquad T_{r,s} = \max_{I\in\mathcal{J}_{r,s}} \prod_{j\in I\,,\, j\geq 1} \frac{1}{a_j \delta_j^2} \ \text{ for } r \geq 1 \,,\ s \geq 1 \ . \tag{49}$$

For consistency reasons, of course, the product in the definition above is put to be equal to 1 when any factor of type $(a_j\delta_j^2)^{-1}$ does not occur.

Lemma 7: *The sequence $T_{r,s}$ satisfies the following properties for all $r, s \geq 1$:*
(i) $T_{r-1,s} \leq T_{r,s}$ and $T_{r',s} = T_{s,s}$ for $r' > s$;
(ii) $T_{r-1,r}T_{r,s}/(a_m\delta_m^2) \leq T_{r,r+s}$, where $m = \min\{r, s\}$.

In the present case too, the proof of lemma above is deferred to appendix A.2.

4.2 Convergence of the algorithm under non-resonance conditions

The estimates of the norms of the functions must take into account many contributions of different type. In the previous subsection, we provided the tools to control the accumulation of the small divisors, now we need some suitable definitions to evaluate other contributions. First, it is convenient to introduce the constant

$$M = \max\left\{1 \,,\, \bar{E}\left(\frac{2e}{\varrho\sigma} + \frac{e^2}{R^2}\right)\right\} \ , \tag{50}$$

so that many parameters can be considered all together in the estimates. Moreover, in order to bound the effects due to the generating functions $\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}$, which remove the non-diagonal terms depending on $(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$, we define the sequence $\{\zeta_r\}_{r\geq 0}$ as

$$\zeta_0 = 0 \ , \qquad \zeta_1 = 0 \ , \qquad \zeta_r = \zeta_{r-1} + \frac{2^{-(r+6)}}{1 - 2^{-(r+6)}} \quad \text{for } r \geq 2 \ . \tag{51}$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_2^{(1)} = 0$ (as shown in subsection 2.4.1), the first value of index r for which $\zeta_r \neq 0$ refers to the second step of normalization. Furthermore, the scheme of estimates also requires to control the number of summands involved in the recursive formulæ (13), (18) and (23). For this purpose, we introduce three sequences of integer

numbers $\{\nu_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 0\,,\,s\geq 0}$, $\{\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 1\,,\,s\geq 0}$ and $\{\nu^{(\mathrm{II})}_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 1\,,\,s\geq 0}$ defined as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu_{0,s} &= 1 && \text{for } s\geq 0\,,\\
\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor} \nu^{j}_{r-1,r}\nu_{r-1,s-jr} && \text{for } r\geq 1\,,\ s\geq 0\,,\\
\nu^{(\mathrm{II})}_{r,s} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor} (\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r})^{j}\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s-jr} && \text{for } r\geq 1\,,\ s\geq 0\,,\\
\nu_{r,s} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor} (\nu^{(\mathrm{II})}_{r,r})^{j}\nu^{(\mathrm{II})}_{r,s-jr} && \text{for } r\geq 1\,,\ s\geq 0\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{52}
$$

We are now ready to claim the main lemma of the "purely analytic" part.

Lemma 8: *Let us consider a Hamiltonian $H^{(0)}$ expanded as in (4) and satisfying points (c')–(e') of lemma 2. Let us assume that on $H^{(0)}$ we can perform at least the first $r\geq 1$ normalization steps of the formal algorithm described in section 2 and*

$$
\varepsilon^{i-1}\left[\frac{M^{3i}}{b_i}\,\frac{T^{3}_{i,i}}{\left(a_i\delta_i^2\right)^2}\,\nu_{i,i}\exp(i\zeta_{i-1})\right]\leq\frac{1}{2^{i+6}}\qquad \textit{for } 2\leq i\leq r\ .
\tag{53}
$$

Then, the following upper bounds on the generating functions hold true:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{2e}{\varrho\sigma}+\frac{e^2}{R^2}\right)\frac{1}{\delta_r^2}\,\|\chi_0^{(r)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}} &\leq M^{3r-2}\,\frac{T^{3}_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\,\nu_{r-1,r}\exp(r\zeta_{r-1})\ ,\\
\left(\frac{2e}{\varrho\sigma}+\frac{e^2}{R^2}\right)\frac{1}{\delta_r^2}\,\|\chi_1^{(r)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} &\leq M^{3r-1}\,\frac{T^{3}_{r,r}}{\left(a_r\delta_r^2\right)^2}\,\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r}\exp(r\zeta_{r-1})\ ,\\
\left(\frac{2e}{\varrho\sigma}+\frac{e^2}{R^2}\right)\frac{1}{\delta_r^2}\,\|\chi_2^{(r)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-2\delta_r} &\leq M^{3r}\left(\frac{T_{r,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^{3}\nu^{(\mathrm{II})}_{r,r}\exp(r\zeta_{r-1})\ ,\\
\varepsilon^{j(r-1)}\|\mathcal{E}_j^{(r)}g\|_{1-d_r} &\leq 2^{-j(r+6)}\|g\|_{1-d_{r-1}-3\delta_r}\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{54}
$$

where the latter inequality is satisfied for all $j\geq 0$ and any analytic function g with finite norm $\|g\|_{1-d_{r-1}-3\delta_r}$, being $\{\mathcal{E}_j^{(r)}\}_{j\geq 0}$ the sequence of operators defined in (24) and related to the Lie transform operator $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}}$. Furthermore, the terms appearing in the expansion of the new Hamiltonian $H^{(r)}$ in (34) are bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|f_\ell^{(r,s)}\|_{1-d_r} &\leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s-3+\ell}}{2^\ell}\,\frac{T^{3}_{r,s}}{\left(a_r\delta_r^2\right)^\ell}\,\nu_{r,s}\exp(s\zeta_r) && \text{for } 0\leq\ell\leq 2\,,\ s>r\,,\\
\|f_\ell^{(r,0)}\|_{1-d_r} &\leq \frac{\bar{E}}{2^\ell}\nu_{r,0} && \text{for } \ell\geq 3\,,\\
\|f_\ell^{(r,s)}\|_{1-d_r} &\leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s}}{2^\ell}\left(\frac{T_{r,s}}{a_m\delta_m^2}\right)^{3}\nu_{r,s}\exp(s\zeta_r) && \text{for } \ell\geq 3\,,\ s\geq 1\,,\\
& && \quad \textit{with}\ \ m=\min\{r,s\}\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{55}
$$

Finally, for $r \geq 2$, the variations of the frequencies, induced by the r-th normalization step, are bounded by

$$\max_{\substack{1\leq i\leq n_1\\ 1\leq j\leq n_2}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma}\left|\omega_i^{(r)} - \omega_i^{(r-1)}\right| , \varepsilon\left|\Omega_j^{(r)} - \Omega_j^{(r-1)}\right| \right\} \leq \varepsilon^r M^{3r} \left(\frac{T_{r,r}}{a_r \delta_r^2}\right)^3 \nu_{r,r} \exp(r\zeta_r) \ . \tag{56}$$

The proof of lemma above needs many essentially trivial computations, nevertheless it is outlined in an exhaustive way in appendix A.3.

In the statement of lemma 8, the hypothesis requiring that the first r normalization steps can be formally performed essentially means that the non-resonance conditions (6) and (7) are satisfied, so that all $a_1, \ldots, a_r$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_r$ are positive. However, in order to ensure the uniform convergence of the Hamiltonian $H^{(r)}$ to the wanted normal form, we need some stronger assumptions like, for instance, the following one (that has been adopted also in [8]).

Definition 2: *We say that the sequence $\{a_r\}_{r\geq 1}$, introduced in (6), satisfies the* **condition $\boldsymbol{\tau}$**, *if*

$$-\sum_{r\geq 1} \frac{\log a_r}{r(r+1)} = \Gamma < \infty \ . \tag{57}$$

We can now provide an estimate for the quantities $T_{r,s}$ appearing in lemma 8.

Lemma 9: *Let the sequence $\{a_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ satisfy condition $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and the sequence $\{\delta_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ be defined as in (48). Then, the sequence $\{T_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 0\,,\, s\geq 0}$ is bounded by*

$$T_{r,s} \leq \frac{1}{a_s \delta_s^2} T_{r,s} \leq \left(2^{15} e^{\Gamma}\right)^s \qquad \text{for } r \geq 1\,,\ s \geq 1 \ .$$

Also the number of summands involved in the recursive formulæ (13), (18) and (23) needs to be controlled by some special estimates.

Lemma 10: *The sequence of positive integer numbers $\{\nu_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 0\,,\, s\geq 0}$ defined in (52) is bounded by*

$$\nu_{r,s} \leq \nu_{s,s} \leq 2^{8s} \qquad \text{for } r \geq 0\,,\ s \geq 0 \ .$$

The proofs of the two lemmas above are deferred to appendix A.4.

All the formulæ (53)–(56) appearing in the main lemma 8 look extremely complex, as they are written in a suitable way to prove the lemma by induction. Therefore, we summarize in a more complete and compact way all the "purely analytical" part studying the convergence of our algorithm.

Proposition 1: *Let us consider an analytic Hamiltonian $H^{(0)} : \mathcal{D}_{\varrho,R,\sigma} \to \mathbb{C}$ expanded as in (4), that satisfies hypotheses (c')–(e') of lemma 2 and is such that it is possible to perform infinitely many normalization steps of the formal algorithm described in section 2. Moreover, assume that*

(f') the sequences of frequency vectors $\{\omega^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ and $\{\Omega^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ (defined in subsection 2.4.2) fulfill the non-resonance conditions $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and (7) with $b_r \geq \bar{b} > 0$ for $r \geq 1$, respectively;

(g') the parameter ε is smaller than the "analytic threshold value" $\varepsilon^\star_{\rm an}$, being

$$\varepsilon^\star_{\rm an} = \frac{1}{2^8}\left(\frac{\min\{1\,,\,\bar b\}}{\mathcal{A}}\right)^2 \qquad \textit{with} \qquad \mathcal{A} = \left(2^{18} M\, e^{\Gamma}\right)^3\,, \tag{58}$$

where M and Γ are defined in (50) and (57), respectively.

Then, there exists an analytic canonical transformation $\Phi^{(\infty)}_{\omega^{(0)}} : \mathcal{D}_{1/2(\varrho,R,\sigma)} \to \mathcal{D}_{3/4(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$ such that the Hamiltonian $H^{(\infty)} = H^{(0)} \circ \Phi^{(\infty)}_{\omega^{(0)}}$ is in normal form, i.e.,

$$H^{(\infty)} = \omega^{(\infty)} \cdot p + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \Omega^{(\infty)}_j z_j \bar z_j + \sum_{\ell>2} \sum_{s\geq 0} \varepsilon^s f^{(\infty,s)}_\ell\,. \tag{59}$$

Furthermore, the norms of the functions $f^{(\infty,s)}_\ell \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$ are bounded by

$$\left\| f^{(\infty,s)}_\ell \right\|_{3/4} \leq \frac{\bar E}{2^\ell} \mathcal{A}^s \qquad \textit{for } \ell \geq 3\,,\ s \geq 0 \tag{60}$$

and both the limit values of the frequency vectors $\omega^{(\infty)}$ and $\Omega^{(\infty)}$ are well defined, being $\{\omega^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ and $\{\Omega^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ Cauchy sequences, as their r-th variations are such that

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq n_1} \left\{ \left|\omega^{(r)}_i - \omega^{(r-1)}_i\right| \right\} \leq \sigma \left(\varepsilon \mathcal{A}\right)^r\,, \qquad \max_{1\leq j\leq n_2} \left\{ \left|\Omega^{(r)}_j - \Omega^{(r-1)}_j\right| \right\} \leq \varepsilon^{r-1} \mathcal{A}^r\,, \tag{61}$$

for $r \geq 2$, while at the first normalization step the equations in (38) hold true.

Since most of the preliminary work has been previously carried out through all the present section, the proof of the proposition above is now rather easy and can be sketched as follows. First, let us remark that we can apply lemma 8, since condition (53) is always satisfied under the hypotheses of proposition 1, as it can be easily verified using lemmas 9–10 and the elementary inequality $\exp(\zeta_s) < 2$ for $s \geq 0$ (see (51)). Thus, starting from the inequalities in formula (55) and using property (i) of lemma 7, some trivial calculations allow us to ensure that

$$\|f^{(r,s)}_\ell\|_{1-d_r} \leq \frac{\bar E}{2^\ell} \mathcal{A}^s \qquad \text{for } 0 \leq \ell \leq 2\,,\ s > r \ \text{ or } \ \ell \geq 3\,,\ s \geq 0\,. \tag{62}$$

Since $\varepsilon\mathcal{A} < 1$ (actually $\varepsilon\mathcal{A} < 1/\mathcal{A} \ll 1$, in view of condition (g') combined with the definitions in (50) and (57)), as an immediate consequence of the estimate (62), we can deduce that $H^{(r)}$, written in (34), is analytic on $\mathcal{D}_{(1-d_r)(\varrho,R,\sigma)} \supset \mathcal{D}_{3/4(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$. Starting from (56) and using condition (g'), some calculations analogous to those required by (62) allow us to verify the inequalities in (61).

Let us now focus on the difference $H^{(r)} - H^{(r-1)}$. Starting from equations (34) and (8), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(r)} - H^{(r-1)} &= \left(\omega^{(r)} - \omega^{(r-1)}\right) \cdot p + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \left(\Omega^{(r)}_j - \Omega^{(r-1)}_j\right) z_j \bar z_j \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell\geq 0} \sum_{s\geq r} \varepsilon^s \left(f^{(r,s)}_\ell - f^{(r-1,s)}_\ell\right) + \sum_{\ell>2} \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j\geq 1} \varepsilon^{s+j(r-1)} \mathcal{E}^{(r)}_j f^{(r-1,s)}_\ell\,, \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where we used the recursive definitions in (37), the fact that $\mathcal{E}_0^{(r)}$ is equal to the identity and the equation $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,s)} = f_\ell^{(r-1,s)}$ for $\ell \geq 3\,,\ 1 \leq s \leq r-1$ (because of formulæ (13), (18), (23)). Therefore, we have that

$$\left\| H^{(r)} - H^{(r-1)} \right\|_{3/4} \leq \left(n_1 \sigma \varrho + \frac{n_2 R^2}{\varepsilon} + \frac{4\bar{E}}{1-\varepsilon\mathcal{A}} \right) (\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^r + \frac{2^{-(r+6)}}{1-2^{-(r+6)}} \frac{\bar{E}\,\varepsilon\mathcal{A}}{1-\varepsilon\mathcal{A}}\,, \tag{64}$$

where we used the fourth inequality in (54) and those in (61)–(62). Since the r.h.s. of the estimate above tends to zero for $r \to \infty$ and that the sup-norm is bounded by the weighted Fourier one, then $\{H^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ is a *Cauchy sequence* of analytic Hamiltonians and it admits a limit $H^{(\infty)}$. Moreover, formulæ (63)–(64) imply that also $\{\omega^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$, $\{\Omega^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ and $\{f_\ell^{(r,s)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ for $\ell \geq 3\,,\ s \geq 0$ are *Cauchy sequences*, thus the expansion of the Hamiltonian $H^{(\infty)} = \lim_{r\to\infty} H^{(r)}$ cannot differ from that written in (59), where the terms $f_\ell^{(\infty,s)} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell,sK}$ are bounded as in (60), in view of inequality (62).

In order to conclude the proof of proposition 1 we need some arguments which are often used in the framework of a KAM theorem based on canonical transformations performed by Lie series. For sake of completeness, we sketch here the essential ideas; more details are available, for instance, in subsection 4.3 of [6]. Let us denote with $\varphi^{(r)}$ the canonical change of coordinates induced by the r-th normalization step of the formal algorithm described in section 2, i.e.,

$$\varphi^{(r)}(p,q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z}) = \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_0^{(r)}}\right) \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_1^{(r)}}\right) \exp\left(\varepsilon^r \mathcal{L}_{\chi_2^{(r)}}\right) \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}}(p,q,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z})\,. \tag{65}$$

Using the fourth inequality in (54), one can easily verify that

$$\max_{1\leq j\leq n_2} \left\{ \left\| \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon^{r-1}\mathcal{D}_2^{(r)}} z_j - z_j \right\|_{3/4} \right\} < \delta_r R\,. \tag{66}$$

Analogous estimates can be deduced for both the other Lie series appearing in (65) and all the canonical variables, using again the inequalities in (54). Therefore, one has that $\varphi^{(r)}(\mathcal{D}_{(1/2+d_{r-1})(\varrho,R,\sigma)}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{(1/2+d_r)(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$ and $\Phi^{(r)}(\mathcal{D}_{1/2(\varrho,R,\sigma)}) \subset \mathcal{D}_{3/4(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$, being $\Phi^{(r)} = \varphi^{(1)} \circ \ldots \circ \varphi^{(r)}$. By repeatedly using the so-called exchange theorem for Lie series (and Lie transforms), one immediately obtains that $H^{(r)} = H^{(0)} \circ \Phi^{(r)}$. By using estimate (66) and the ones related to the other generating functions, we can prove that the canonical transformation $\Phi_{\omega^{(0)}}^{(\infty)} = \lim_{r\to\infty} \Phi^{(r)}$ is well defined in $\mathcal{D}_{1/2(\varrho,R,\sigma)}$. Finally, we have that $H^{(0)} \circ \Phi_{\omega^{(0)}}^{(\infty)} = \lim_{r\to\infty} H^{(0)} \circ \Phi^{(r)} = \lim_{r\to\infty} H^{(r)} = H^{(\infty)}$.

Actually, with some additional effort, we could prove that $\Phi_{\omega^{(0)}}^{(\infty)}$ differs from the identity just for terms of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. As a final comment, let us remark that in the symbol $\Phi_{\omega^{(0)}}^{(\infty)}$, we emphasized the parametric dependence of that canonical transformation on the initial frequency $\omega^{(0)}$, as it is in the spirit of the next section.

5. Measure of the resonant regions

The aim of this section is to show that the set of frequencies to which our algorithm

applies has relative big measure. To this end we must exploit the dependence of the whole procedure on the frequency vector $\omega^{(0)}$, that has been neglected in the analytic construction. Thus we focus here on the sequence $\left\{(\omega^{(r)}\,,\,\varepsilon\Omega^{(r)})\right\}_{r\geq 0}$ and on its dependence on $\omega^{(0)}$, with the aim of selecting the set of frequencies $\omega^{(0)}$ for which the sequence $(\omega^{(r)}\,,\,\varepsilon\Omega^{(r)})$ satisfies all the non-resonant conditions that are requested so as to ensure the convergence. Therefore we extract from the discussion of section 4 just the essential information concerning the shift of the frequencies at each normalization step, i.e., the estimates (61).

Let us recall that both $\omega^{(r)}$ and $\Omega^{(r)}$ are iteratively defined according to the prescriptions given in section 2 and their values actually depend on all terms appearing in the expansion (4) of the initial Hamiltonian $H^{(0)}$. Nevertheless, with a little abuse of notation, in the present section and in appendix A.5, the quantities $\omega^{(r)}$ and $\Omega^{(r)}$ are regarded as analytic functions of the frequencies $\omega^{(0)}$ only, on some open domain that can be defined as follows. We start from the compact set $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and its complex extension $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}$, where the Hamiltonian $H^{(0)}$ is well defined and the Jacobian of $\Omega^{(0)}(\omega^{(0)})$ is bounded. We consider a sequence of complex extended domains $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0} \supseteq \mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1} \supseteq \mathcal{W}^{(2)}_{h_2} \supseteq \ldots$, where $\{h_r\}_{r\geq 0}$ is a positive non-increasing sequence of real numbers such that $\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})$ admits an inverse function $\varphi^{(r)}$ well defined on $\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}$. In detail, let us start by setting $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} = \mathcal{W}^{(0)}$. For $r \geq 2$ and some fixed positive values of the parameters $\gamma\,,\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the sequence of real domains $\{\mathcal{W}^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$, so that at each step r, we remove from $\mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}$ all the resonant regions related to the new small divisors appearing in the formal algorithm (see section 2); therefore,

$$\mathcal{W}^{(r)} = \mathcal{W}^{(r-1)} \setminus \mathcal{R}^{(r)}\ , \qquad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{R}^{(r)} = \bigcup_{\substack{rK<|k|\leq(r+1)K \\ |l|\leq 2}} \mathcal{R}^{(r)}_{k,l}\ , \tag{67}$$

being

$$\mathcal{R}^{(r)}_{k,l} = \left\{\omega \in \mathcal{W}^{(r-1)} : \left|k\cdot\omega + \varepsilon l\ \cdot \Omega^{(r)}\circ\varphi^{(r)}(\omega)\right| < \frac{2\gamma}{\big((r+1)K\big)^{\tau}}\right\}\ . \tag{68}$$

Moreover, it is also convenient to introduce the functions $\delta\omega^{(r)}$ and $\Delta\Omega^{(r)}$ defined as

$$\delta\omega^{(r)} = \omega^{(r)}\circ\varphi^{(r-1)} - \mathrm{Id}\ , \qquad \Delta\Omega^{(r)} = \Omega^{(r)}\circ\varphi^{(r-1)} - \Omega^{(r-1)}\circ\varphi^{(r-1)}\ . \tag{69}$$

By the way, let us remark that from equations in (38) we have $\delta\omega^{(1)} = 0$ and $\Delta\Omega^{(1)} = 0$.

We now adapt the approach by Pöschel[17] to our context in the following

Proposition 2: *Let us consider the family (4) of Hamiltonians $H^{(0)}$ parameterized by the n_1-dimensional frequency vector $\omega^{(0)}$. Assume that there exist positive parameters γ, τ, $\bar{b}$, J_0, a positive integer K and a compact set $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ such that the function $\Omega^{(0)} : \mathcal{W}_{h_0} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ is analytic and satisfies the properties (a')–(b') of lemma 2. Define the sequence $\{h_r\}_{r\geq 0}$ of complex extensions as*

$$h_0 = \min\left\{\frac{\gamma\eta}{4K^{\tau}}\,,\ \frac{\bar{b}}{4J_0}\right\} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad h_r = \frac{h_{r-1}}{2^{\tau+2}} \quad \textit{for } r \geq 1\ , \tag{70}$$

where $\eta = \min\{1/K\,,\,\sigma\}$.
Considering the sequence of Hamiltonians $\{H^{(r)}\}_{r\geq 0}$ *, formally defined by the algorithm in section 2, let us assume that the functions* $\omega^{(1)}$, $\Omega^{(1)}$, $\dots$, $\omega^{(r)}$, $\Omega^{(r)}$ *satisfy the following hypotheses up to a fixed normalization step* $r \geq 0$

(h') *the function* $\omega^{(s)}(\omega^{(0)})$ *has analytic inverse* $\varphi^{(s)}$ *on* $\mathcal{W}^{(s)}_{h_s}$ *, for* $0 \leq s \leq r-1$*, where* $\varphi^{(0)} = \mathrm{Id}$ *and the domains are recursively defined as extensions of those given by formulæ (67)–(68), starting from* $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} = \mathcal{W}$ *;*

(i') *both* $\omega^{(s)} \circ \varphi^{(s-1)} : \mathcal{W}^{(s-1)}_{h_{s-1}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ *and* $\Omega^{(s)} \circ \varphi^{(s-1)} : \mathcal{W}^{(s-1)}_{h_{s-1}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_2}$ *are analytic functions, for* $1 \leq s \leq r$ *;*

(j') *there exist positive parameters* ε , σ *and* $\mathcal{A} \geq 1$ *satisfying*

$$\max_{1\leq j\leq n_1} \sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(s-1)}_{h_{s-1}}} \left|\delta\omega^{(s)}_j(\omega)\right| \leq \sigma\big(\varepsilon\mathcal{A}\big)^s \;, \qquad \max_{1\leq j\leq n_2} \sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(s-1)}_{h_{s-1}}} \left|\Delta\Omega^{(s)}_j(\omega)\right| \leq \varepsilon^{s-1}\mathcal{A}^s \;, \tag{71}$$

for $2 \leq s \leq r$ *, where* $\delta\omega^{(s)}$ *and* $\Delta\Omega^{(s)}$ *are defined as in (69), with* $\delta\omega^{(1)} = 0$ *and* $\Delta\Omega^{(1)} = 0$ *;*

(k') *the parameter* ε *is smaller than the "geometric threshold value"*

$$\varepsilon^*_{\mathrm{ge}} = \min\left\{ \frac{1}{(2J_0+1)\eta}\,,\; \frac{1}{2^{\tau+3}\mathcal{A}}\,\min\left\{1\,,\,\frac{h_0}{8\mathcal{A}}\,,\,\frac{\bar b}{8\mathcal{A}}\right\}\right\} \;; \tag{72}$$

Then, the function $\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})$ *admits an analytic inverse* $\varphi^{(r)} : \mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r} \to \mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}$ *on its domain of definition and satisfies the inclusion relation* $\varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big) \subset \varphi^{(r-1)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}}\big)$ *. Moreover, the following non-resonance inequalities hold true:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\substack{k\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_1}\,,\,0<|k|\leq(r+1)K\\ l\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_2}\,,\,0\leq|l|\leq 2}} \inf_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}} \Big|k\cdot\omega + \varepsilon l\,\cdot\Omega^{(r)}\big(\varphi^{(r)}(\omega)\big)\Big| \geq \frac{\gamma}{\big((r+1)K\big)^\tau} \;, \\ &\min_{1\leq i<j\leq n_2} \inf_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}} \Big|\Omega^{(r)}_i\big(\varphi^{(r)}(\omega)\big) - \Omega^{(r)}_j\big(\varphi^{(r)}(\omega)\big)\Big| \geq \bar b \;. \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Finally, the Lipschitz constant related to the Jacobian of the functions $\varphi^{(r)}$ *and* $\Omega^{(r)}\circ\varphi^{(r)}$ *are uniformly bounded as*

$$\left|\frac{\partial\big(\varphi^{(r)}-\mathrm{Id}\big)}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}} \leq \varepsilon\sigma \;, \qquad \left|\frac{\partial\big(\Omega^{(r)}\circ\varphi^{(r)}\big)}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}} \leq 2J_0+1 \;. \tag{74}$$

The proof is deferred to appendix A.5.

The proposition above allows us to prove the persistence of a set of tori characterized by "Diophantine" frequencies, according to the following

Definition 3: *For any fixed* $\omega^{(0)}$ *, we say that the sequence of frequency vectors* $\big\{\big(\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})\,,\,\varepsilon\Omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})\big)\big\}_{r\geq 0}$ *is Diophantine, if there are three positive constants* γ *,* τ *and* $\bar b$ *such that, for all* $r \geq 1$*, (6) and (7) are satisfied with* $a_r = \gamma/(rK)^\tau$ *and* $b_r \geq \bar b$ *.*

We emphasize that the non-resonance condition given by the definition above is stronger than the condition $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ in (57) considered in section 4.

We denote by $\mathcal{K}_l^{(r)}$ the closed convex hull of the gradient set

$$\mathcal{G}_l^{(r)} = \left\{ \partial_\omega \left[\varepsilon l \cdot \Omega^{(r)} \left(\varphi^{(r)}(\omega) \right) \right] \ : \ \omega \in \mathcal{W}^{(r)} \right\} \ . \tag{75}$$

Due to the fact that the transversal frequencies are $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, we can ensure that the closed convex hull does not contain any integer vector except the zero vector. To this aim, we must ensure the further smallness condition

$$\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4(2J_0+1)} \ , \tag{76}$$

so that $\mathrm{dist}(k, \mathcal{K}_l^{(r)}) \geq 1/2$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \setminus \{0\}$ (with respect to the euclidean norm).

We now need to estimate the volume of the resonant zones that we must remove at each step of the procedure and show that the final "good domain", $\lim_{r\to\infty} \varphi^{(r)}(\mathcal{W}^{(r)})$, has positive Lebesgue measure. To this aim, we report lemma 8.1 of Pöschel[17].

Lemma 11: *If* $\mathrm{dist}(k, \mathcal{K}_l^{(r)}) = s > 0$ *then*

$$\mathrm{m}(\mathcal{R}_{k,l}^{(r)}) \leq \frac{4\gamma}{((r+1)K)^\tau} \frac{D^{n_1-1}}{s} \ ,$$

where D *is the diameter of* $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}$ *with respect to the sup-norm.*

The volume of the resonant regions must be compared with respect to the initial set $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}$. Therefore, it is convenient to estimate the measure of $\varphi^{(r)}(\mathcal{R}_{k,l}^{(r)})$ in the original coordinates $\omega^{(0)}$. Using lemma 11 and assumption (76), for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1} \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$\mathrm{m}\Big(\varphi^{(r)} \big(\mathcal{R}_{k,l}^{(r)} \big) \Big) \leq \frac{8\gamma D^{n_1-1}}{((r+1)K)^\tau} \sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}^{(r)}} \det \left(\frac{\partial \varphi^{(r)}}{\partial \omega} \right) \ . \tag{77}$$

Starting from the first inequality in (74) and using the well known Gershgorin circle theorem, one can easily control the actual expansion of the resonant zones due to the stretching of the frequencies, by verifying that

$$\sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{W}^{(r)}} \det \left(\frac{\partial \varphi^{(r)}}{\partial \omega} \right) \leq 2 \qquad \text{when} \quad \varepsilon \leq \frac{\log 2}{\sigma n_1^2} \ . \tag{78}$$

Using the inequalities (77)–(78), we can easily obtain a final estimate of the total volume of the resonant regions included in $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{rK<|k|\leq(r+1)K \\ |l|\leq 2}} \mathrm{m}\Big(\varphi^{(r)} \big(\mathcal{R}_{k,l}^{(r)} \big) \Big) &\leq c_{n_2} \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \sum_{(r-1)K<|k|\leq rK} \frac{16\gamma D^{n_1-1}}{((r+1)K)^\tau} \\ &\leq \gamma \ \frac{2^{n_1+4} c_{n_2} D^{n_1-1}}{K^{\tau-n_1}} \sum_{r=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r^{\tau-n_1+1}} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

where $c_{n_2} = (2n_2+2)(2n_2+1)/2$ is the maximum number of polynomial terms having degree ≤ 2 in the transversal variables $(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$. The last series is convergent if $\tau > n_1$ and it is of order $\mathcal{O}(\gamma)$.

6. Proof of theorem 1

The proof is a straightforward combination of propositions 1 and 2, which summarize the "purely analytical" study of the convergence of our algorithm and the more "geometrical part", respectively. We sketch the argument.

According to lemma 2 the family of Hamiltonians $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$, parameterized by the frequency vectors $\omega^{(0)}$ and defined on a real domain, can be extended to a complex domain $\mathcal{D}_{\varrho,R,\sigma} \times \mathcal{W}_{h_0}$ with suitable parameters; moreover, their expansions can be written as $H^{(0)}$ in (4). Possibly modifying the values of parameters γ and τ, we can choose γ and $\tau > n_1$ such that the estimate of the resonant volume in the last row of (79) is smaller than $\mathrm{m}(\mathcal{W}_{h_0})$ and property (a') of lemma 2 is still satisfied. Let us consider values of the small parameter ε such that $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^\star$, with

$$\varepsilon^\star = \min\left\{ \varepsilon^\star_{\mathrm{an}}\,,\, \varepsilon^\star_{\mathrm{ge}}\,,\, \frac{1}{4(2J_0+1)}\,,\, \frac{\log 2}{\sigma n_1^2} \right\}\,, \tag{80}$$

where $\varepsilon^\star_{\mathrm{an}}$ and $\varepsilon^\star_{\mathrm{ge}}$ are defined in (58) and (72), respectively.

Recall that the r-th normalization step of the formal algorithm described in section 2 can be performed if the non-resonance conditions (6)–(7) are satisfied. Assuming the threshold value $\varepsilon^\star$ as in (80) lemma 2 and proposition 2 ensures that the first step can be performed for every frequency vector $\omega^{(0)} \in \mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}$.

We now proceed by induction. Let us suppose that $r-1$ steps have been performed and proposition 2 applies. In view of the non-resonance condition (73) the r-th normalization step can be performed. We now check that proposition 2 applies again. By construction, both $\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})$ and $\Omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})$ are analytic functions on $\varphi^{(r-1)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}}\big)$. In view of $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^\star$, then hypothesis (g') of proposition 1 is satisfied, so lemma 8 applies and the estimate (61) on the shift of the frequencies holds true. Thus proposition 2 can be applied at the r-th step which complete the induction.

We conclude that the non-resonance conditions (73) hold true for $r \geq 0$ and that the sequence of frequency vectors $\big\{\big(\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})\,,\, \varepsilon\Omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})\big)\big\}_{r\geq 0}$ is Diophantine for $\omega^{(0)} \in \lim_{r\to\infty} \varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big) = \bigcap_{r=0}^{\infty} \varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big)$, where we used the inclusion relation $\varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big) \subset \varphi^{(r-1)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}}\big)$ between open sets. Finally, also hypothesis (f') of proposition 1 is satisfied and so, for $\omega^{(0)} \in \bigcap_{r=0}^{\infty} \varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big)$, there exists an analytic canonical transformation $\Phi^{(\infty)}_{\omega^{(0)}}$ which gives the initial Hamiltonian $H^{(0)}$ the normal form (59). Since $\bigcap_{r=0}^{\infty} \varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big)$ is a countable intersection of open sets, it is measurable and

$$\mathrm{m}\Big(\bigcap_{r=0}^{\infty} \varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big)\Big) \geq \mathrm{m}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(0)}\big) - \sum_{r=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{rK<|k|\leq(r+1)K \\ |l|\leq 2}} \mathrm{m}\Big(\varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{R}^{(r)}_{k,l}\big)\Big) > 0\,,$$

where we have taken into account the fact that the complex extension radius $h_r \to 0$ for $r \to \infty$, the estimate (79) and the initial choice of the parameters γ and τ at the beginning of the present section. This concludes the argument proving theorem 1.

We now add a short remark concerning the comparison with the estimates in previous works. The threshold value $\varepsilon^\star$ on the small parameter ε is explicitly defined in (80). Although the definition involves many parameters, we might produce an asymptotic estimate of the volume of the resonant regions for $\varepsilon \to 0$. In view of inequality (79) it is $\mathcal{O}(\gamma)$. Moreover, one can easily show[†] that $\varepsilon^\star \leq \varepsilon^\star_{\rm an} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma^6)$. Thus the complement of the set of the invariant elliptic tori, i.e., $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \setminus \bigcap_{r=0}^{\infty} \varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r)}_{h_r}\big)$, has a measure estimated by $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{1/6})$. This is definitely worse than the results obtained in [2] and [3], where this same quantity has been proven to be smaller than a bound $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{b_1})$, with $b_1 < 1/2$. However, let us emphasize that our main interest is to establish the convergence of a constructive algorithm suitable for computer assisted applications. As a matter of facts, by explicitly performing a number of perturbation steps, both the applicability threshold and the estimate of the measure can be significantly improved, possibly giving realistic estimates for physical systems. On the other hand it is well known that purely analytical estimates are usually unrealistically small. For this reason we did not pay attention in producing optimal estimates.

A. Technicalities

The appendix is devoted to technical details and proofs which have been moved here in order to avoid the overloading of the text.

A.1 Estimates for multiple Poisson brackets

In the present subsection, we will replace $|\cdot|_{\alpha\varrho,\alpha R}$ with $|\cdot|_\alpha$, being α any real positive number, so as to shorten the notation in an analogous way to what is done for $\|\cdot\|_{\alpha\varrho,\alpha R,\alpha\sigma}$ and $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$. Let us recall that both the norms $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ and $|\cdot|_\alpha$ are defined in (41).

Some Cauchy's estimates on the derivatives in the restricted domains will be useful during the following proof. Let us recall them by referring to any function g satisfying the hypotheses of lemma 3:

$$\left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_j}\right|_{1-d-d'} \leq \frac{|g|_{1-d'}}{d\varrho}\ , \qquad \left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}\right|_{1-d-d'} \leq \frac{|g|_{1-d'}}{dR}\ . \tag{81}$$

Of course, the latter inequality holds true also by replacing z_j with $\bar z_j$.

Before considering the multiple Lie derivatives for the flow along a generating function, it is convenient to provide a suitable estimate for a single Poisson bracket.

[†] First, let us remark that $\varepsilon^\star_{\rm an} = \mathcal{O}(e^{-6\Gamma})$ in view of the definitions in (58). By definitions 2 and 3 we get that $\Gamma = \sum_{r\geq 1}[-\log\gamma + \tau\log(rK)]/[r(r+1)]$. Therefore, $e^{-\Gamma} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma)$, as one can easily verify that $\sum_{r\geq 1} 1/[r(r+1)] = 1$. For this purpose, it is enough to check by induction that $\sum_{r=1}^{s} 1/[r(r+1)] = s/(s+1)$ for $s \geq 1$.

Lemma 12: *Let d, $d' \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $d + d' < 1$ and g, g' be two analytic functions such that their corresponding norms $\|g\|_{1-d-d'}$ and $\|g'\|_{1-d'}$ are finite. Then, for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $d + d' + \delta < 1$ the following inequality holds true:*

$$\|\{g, g'\}\|_{1-d-d'-\delta} \leq \left(\frac{2}{e\varrho\sigma} + \frac{1}{R^2}\right) \frac{1}{(d+\delta)\delta} \|g\|_{1-d-d'} \|g'\|_{1-d'} \ . \tag{82}$$

Proof. It is convenient to separate the contributions given by the derivatives with respect to the conjugate pairs of variables (p, q) and $(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$. Thus, let us first write the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_j} \frac{\partial g'}{\partial p_j} - \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_j} \frac{\partial g'}{\partial q_j} \right) \right\|_{1-d-d'-\delta} \leq \\ &\qquad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1}} \sum_{k' \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1}} \left[\left(\frac{|k|\, |g_k|_{1-d-d'}\, |g'_{k'}|_{1-d'}}{(d+\delta)\varrho} \right.\right. \\ &\qquad\qquad \left.\left. + \frac{|g_k|_{1-d-d'}\, |k'|\, |g'_{k'}|_{1-d'}}{\delta\varrho} \right) e^{(|k|+|k'|)(1-d-d'-\delta)\sigma} \right] \\ &\qquad \leq \frac{2}{e\varrho\sigma} \frac{1}{(d+\delta)\delta} \|g\|_{1-d-d'} \|g'\|_{1-d'} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

being $g'_{k'} = g'_{k'}(p, z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$ the terms appearing in the expansion for g' analogous to (40); moreover, in the inequalities above we used the first estimate in (81) and the elementary one $ae^{-ab} \leq 1/(eb)$, holding true for any positive real values of a and b.

Let us now focus on the remaining terms of the Poisson bracket. For each point $(p, z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z}) \in \mathcal{G}_{(1-d-d'-\delta)\varrho} \times \mathcal{B}_{(1-d-d'-\delta)R}$ and for all pairs of vectors k, $k' \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1}$, we introduce an auxiliary function

$$G_{(p,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z});k,k'}(t) = g_k\Big(p,\, z - t\frac{\partial g'_{k'}}{\partial(\mathbf{i}\bar{z})},\, \mathbf{i}\bar{z} + t\frac{\partial g'_{k'}}{\partial z}\Big) \ , \tag{84}$$

where we use the multi-index notation also for the derivatives, so that for instance $\partial g'_{k'}/\partial z = \big(\partial g'_{k'}/\partial z_1, \ldots, \partial g'/\partial z_{n_2}\big)$. Since g_k is analytic on $\mathcal{G}_{(1-d-d')\varrho} \times \mathcal{B}_{(1-d-d')R}$, then the auxiliary function $G_{(p,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z});k,k'}$ is certainly analytic for $|t| \leq \bar{t}$, with

$$\bar{t} = \frac{\delta R}{\max\limits_{1 \leq j \leq n_2} \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial g'_{k'}}{\partial z_j} \right|_{1-d-d'-\delta} , \left| \frac{\partial g'_{k'}}{\partial(\mathbf{i}\bar{z}_j)} \right|_{1-d-d'-\delta} \right\}} \ . \tag{85}$$

Thus, the definitions (84)–(85) and the Cauchy's estimate for the derivative of the auxiliary function ensure that

$$\left| \{g_k, g'_{k'}\} \right|_{1-d-d'-\delta} \leq \left| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} G_{(p,z,\mathbf{i}\bar{z});k,k'}(t) \, \Big|_{t=0} \right|_{1-d-d'-\delta} \leq \frac{|g_k|_{1-d-d'}}{\bar{t}} \ . \tag{86}$$

Using the definition of the norm (41), the previous inequalities (85)–(86) and the second one in (81), we get

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial(\mathbf{i}\bar{z}_j)} \frac{\partial g'}{\partial z_j} - \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j} \frac{\partial g'}{\partial(\mathbf{i}\bar{z}_j)} \right) \right\|_{1-d-d'-\delta} \leq \frac{1}{R^2} \frac{\|g\|_{1-d-d'} \, \|g'\|_{1-d'}}{(d+\delta)\delta} \tag{87}$$

By joining (83) and (87), one immediately obtains inequality (82). *Q.E.D.*

The estimate (43) on the multiple Poisson brackets can be now easily verified following, for instance, the proof scheme of lemma 4.2 in [5].

Proof of lemma 3. For $j \geq 1$ let us choose $\delta = d/j$ as small step-size restriction of the analyticity domain. Thus, we obtain (43) by writing the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathcal{L}^j_{\mathcal{X}} g \right\|_{1-d-d'} &\leq \left(\frac{2}{e\varrho\sigma} + \frac{1}{R^2} \right) \frac{1}{j\delta^2} \|\mathcal{X}\|_{1-d'} \left\| \mathcal{L}^{j-1}_{\mathcal{X}} g \right\|_{1-d'-(j-1)\delta} \\ &\leq \dots \\ &\leq \frac{j!}{e^2} \left(\frac{2e}{\varrho\sigma} + \frac{e^2}{R^2} \right)^j \frac{1}{(d^2)^j} \|\mathcal{X}\|^j_{1-d'} \|g\|_{1-d'} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

where we repeatedly applied lemma 12; in particular, in the first row, we used it by replacing g , g' and d with $\mathcal{L}^{j-1}_{\mathcal{X}} g$, $\mathcal{X}$ and $(j-1)\delta$, respectively; in the last row of (88), we used also the trivial inequality $j^j \leq j! e^{j-1}$, holding true for $j \geq 1$. *Q.E.D.*

Proof of lemma 4. The formal procedure defining all the sequence of generating functions $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathcal{X}_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is described in subsection 2.4.1. In the framework of the present lemma, let us consider equations (25)–(32), replacing the symbols ε , $\mathcal{D}_2^{(r;j)}$, $Z_j^{(r)}$, $g_1^{(r)}$, $\Omega_i^{(r-1)}$, $\mathcal{E}_j^{(r)}$, $\Psi_j^{(r)}$ with 1 , $\mathcal{X}_j$, Z_j , g' , Ξ_i , $\mathcal{E}_j$, Ψ_j , respectively. Let us recall that by construction $\mathcal{X}_j$, Z_j , and Ψ_j, for $j \geq 1$, belong to $\mathcal{P}_{2,0} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{0,2,0}$ (i.e., the set of functions that are in $\mathcal{P}_{2,0}$ and depend just on the conjugate canonical coordinates $(z, \mathbf{i}\bar{z})$). Let us consider a generic function $g'' \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{0,2,0}$; since it is a homogeneous quadratic polynomial, its norm is well defined on any domain of type $\mathcal{D}_{\varrho,R,\sigma}$ and it is "scale invariant", i.e., $\|g''\|_{d''} = (d'')^2 \|g''\|_1$ for $d'' \in \mathbb{R}_+$. It is convenient to rewrite the estimate of the Poisson bracket for the special case of functions belonging to $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{0,2,0}$ as follows:

$$\left\| \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}_j} g'' \right\|_{1-d'} \leq 16 \, \frac{\|\mathcal{X}_j\|_{1-d'} \, \|g''\|_{1-d'}}{(1-d')^2 R^2} \qquad \text{for } j \geq 1 \ . \tag{89}$$

In order to verify the inequality above, it is enough to rewrite the estimate (87) in the special case with $d = 0$, $\delta = (1-d')/2$ and use the scale invariance of the norm. Let us stress that the upper bound provided in (89) does not require any restriction of the domain. Starting from the homological equation for the determination of $\mathcal{X}_j$ and its solution (see formulæ (29) and (32), respectively), one has

$$\|\mathcal{X}_j\|_{1-d'} \leq \frac{\|\Psi_j\|_{1-d'}}{\Xi_*} \ , \qquad \|Z_j\|_{1-d'} \leq \|\Psi_j\|_{1-d'} \qquad \text{for } j \geq 1 \ , \tag{90}$$

where we also used hypothesis (i) of the present lemma. Using inequalities (89)–(90), the definition of the operator $\mathcal{E}_j$ in (24) and the fact that for Ψ_j which is analogous to (30),

one can easily justify the following recursive estimates involving just the sequence of functions $\{\Psi_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ and $\{\mathcal{E}_j\, g'\}_{j\geq 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Psi_j\|_{1-d'} &\leq \|\mathcal{E}_{j-1}\, g'\|_{1-d'} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1}\left[\frac{16\, i\, \|\Psi_i\|_{1-d'}}{j(1-d')^2\Xi^* R^2}\left(\|\Psi_{j-i}\|_{1-d'} + \|\mathcal{E}_{j-i-1}\, g'\|_{1-d'}\right)\right]\,, \\ \|\mathcal{E}_j\, g'\|_{1-d'} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{j}\left[\frac{16\, i\, \|\Psi_i\|_{1-d'}}{j(1-d')^2\Xi^* R^2}\,\|\mathcal{E}_{j-i}\, g'\|_{1-d'}\right]\,,\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

holding true for $j \geq 1$. Proceeding by induction, one can easily get the estimate

$$\max\left\{\|\mathcal{E}_{j-1}\, g'\|_{1-d'}\,,\, \frac{1}{2}\,\|\Psi_j\|_{1-d'}\right\} \leq \frac{\lambda_j}{j}\left(\frac{2^7\,\|g'\|_{1-d'}}{(1-d')^2\Xi^* R^2}\right)^{j-1}\|g'\|_{1-d'}\,, \tag{92}$$

for $j \geq 1$ where the starting point is given by $\|\mathcal{E}_0\, g'\|_{1-d'} = \|g'\|_{1-d'}$ and $\{\lambda_j\}_{j\geq 1}$ is the famous Catalan sequence, i.e.,

$$\lambda_1 = 1\,, \qquad \lambda_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1}\lambda_i\lambda_{j-i}\,. \tag{93}$$

Using the estimate $\lambda_j \leq 4^{j-1}$ and inequalities (90) and (92), for $j \geq 1$ we obtain

$$\max\left\{\Xi^*\,\|\mathcal{X}_j\|_{1-d'}\,,\,\|Z_j\|_{1-d'}\right\} \leq \frac{2\,\|g'\|_{1-d'}}{j}\left(\frac{2^9\,\|g'\|_{1-d'}}{(1-d')^2\Xi^* R^2}\right)^{j-1}\,. \tag{94}$$

The estimate above on the generating function $\mathcal{X}_j$, the smallness condition on $\varepsilon^\star_{\rm diag}$ in hypothesis (ii) and a straightforward adaptation of proposition 4.3 in [5] allow us to prove that the Lie transform operator $\mathcal{T}_\mathcal{X}$ properly defines a linear canonical transformation. Actually, such an adaptation is needed because in the framework of section 4 of [5] action-angle variables have been adopted, while in the present context complex canonical coordinates of polynomial type are used.

The first inequality in (44) is a result of the modified version of proposition 4.3 in [5], while the second estimate immediately follows from (94) when $j \geq 2$; in the special case with $j = 1$, that estimate still holds true because from (90)–(91) it follows that $\|Z_1\|_{1-d'} \leq \|\Psi_1\|_{1-d'} \leq \|g'\|_{1-d'}$. *Q.E.D.*

A.2 On the sets of indexes

We report here the proofs of lemmas 5–7.

Proof of lemma 5. The claim (i) is a trivial consequence of the definition.
(ii) For each fixed value of $s > 0$ and $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor s/2\rfloor$, we have to determine the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{M}_{k,s} = \{m \in \mathbb{N}:\ 2 \leq m \leq s\,,\ \lfloor s/m\rfloor = k\}$. For this purpose, we use the

obvious inequalities

$$\left\lfloor \frac{s}{\lfloor s/k \rfloor} \right\rfloor \geq k \quad \text{and} \quad \left\lfloor \frac{s}{\lfloor s/k \rfloor + 1} \right\rfloor < k \ .$$

After having rewritten the same relations with $k+1$ in place of k, one immediately realizes that a index $m \in \mathcal{M}_{k,s}$ *if and only if* $m \leq \lfloor s/k \rfloor$ *and* $m \geq \lfloor s/(k+1) \rfloor + 1$, therefore $\#\mathcal{M}_{k,s} = \left\lfloor \frac{s}{k} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{s}{k+1} \right\rfloor$.
(iii) Since $r \leq s$, the definition in (46) implies that neither $\{r\} \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^*$ nor I_{r+s}^* can include any index exceeding $\left\lfloor (r+s)/2 \right\rfloor$. Thus, let us define some finite sequences of non-negative integers as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R_k &= \#\big\{ j \in I_r^* \ : \ j \leq k \big\} \ , & S_k &= \#\big\{ j \in I_s^* \ : \ j \leq k \big\} \ , \\ M_k &= \#\big\{ j \in \{r\} \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^* \ : \ j \leq k \big\} \ , & N_k &= \#\big\{ j \in I_{r+s}^* \ : \ j \leq k \big\} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where the integer index k ranges in $\big[1, \lfloor (r+s)/2 \rfloor\big]$. When $k < r$, the property (ii) of the present lemma allows us to write

$$R_k = r - \left\lfloor \frac{r}{k+1} \right\rfloor \ , \quad S_k = s - \left\lfloor \frac{s}{k+1} \right\rfloor \ , \quad N_k = r + s - \left\lfloor \frac{r+s}{k+1} \right\rfloor \ ;$$

using the elementary estimate $\lfloor x \rfloor + \lfloor y \rfloor \leq \lfloor x + y \rfloor$, from the equations above it follows that $M_k \geq N_k$ for $1 \leq k < r$. In the remaining cases, i.e., when $r \leq k \leq \lfloor (r+s)/2 \rfloor$, we have that

$$R_k = r - 1 \ , \quad S_k = s - \left\lfloor \frac{s}{k+1} \right\rfloor \ , \quad N_k = r + s - \left\lfloor \frac{r+s}{k+1} \right\rfloor \ ;$$

therefore, $M_k = 1 + R_k + S_k \geq N_k$. Since we have just shown that $M_k \geq N_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor (r+s)/2 \rfloor$, it is now an easy matter to complete the proof. Let us first imagine to have reordered both the set of indexes $r \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^*$ and I_{r+s}^* in increasing order; moreover, let us recall that $\#\big(\{r\} \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^*\big) = \#I_{r+s}^* = r + s - 1$, in view of the definition in (46). Thus, since $M_1 \geq N_1$, every element equal to 1 in $r \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^*$ has a corresponding index in I_{r+s}^* the value of which is at least 1. Analogously, since $M_2 \geq N_2$, every index 2 in $r \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^*$ has a corresponding index in I_{r+s}^* which is at least 2, and so on up to $k = \lfloor (r+s)/2 \rfloor$. This allows us to conclude that $r \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^* \lhd I_{r+s}^*$. *Q.E.D.*

Proof of lemma 6. The points (i) and (ii) of the statement immediately follow from the definition of $\mathcal{J}_{r,s}$.
For what concerns (iii), we first remark that $\#\big(\{\min\{r,s\}\} \cup I \cup I'\big) = 1 + \#(I) + \#(I') = r + s - 1$. Moreover, after having recalled the definition in (45), it is easy to verify that $0 \leq j \leq \min\{r, \lfloor (r+s)/2 \rfloor\}$, for $j \in \big(\{\min\{r,s\}\} \cup I \cup I'\big)$. In order to complete the proof, now we have to check that the selection rule S is satisfied. For this purpose, we first remark that $\big(\{\min\{r,s\}\} \cup I \cup I'\big) \lhd \big(\{\min\{r,s\}\} \cup I_r^* \cup I_s^*\big)$, because $I \in \mathcal{J}_{r-1,r}$ and $I' \in \mathcal{J}_{r,s}$. Therefore, property (iii) of lemma 5 allows us to conclude that $\big(\{\min\{r,s\}\} \cup I \cup I'\big) \lhd I_{r+s}^*$. *Q.E.D.*

Proof of lemma 7. The point (i) of the present lemma immediately follows from property (ii) of lemma 6. In fact, we can write

$$T_{r-1,s} = \max_{I\in\mathcal{J}_{r-1,s}} \prod_{j\in I\,,\,j\geq 1} \frac{1}{a_j\delta_j^2} \leq \max_{I\in\mathcal{J}_{r,s}} \prod_{j\in I\,,\,j\geq 1} \frac{1}{a_j\delta_j^2}\ ,$$

because the maximum is evaluated over a larger set of indexes. Moreover, the equation $T_{r',s} = T_{s,s}$ holds true when $r' > s$, as a trivial consequence of the definition in (49) and property (i) of lemma 6.
Concerning the point (ii), we can evaluate $T_{r-1,r}T_{r,s}/(a_m\delta_m^2)$, where $m = \min\{r,s\}$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{a_m\delta_m^2}T_{r-1,r}T_{r,s} &= \frac{1}{a_m\delta_m^2}\left(\max_{I\in\mathcal{J}_{r-1,r}} \prod_{j\in I\,,\,j\geq 1}\frac{1}{a_j\delta_j^2}\right)\left(\max_{I'\in\mathcal{J}_{r,s}} \prod_{j'\in I'\,,\,j'\geq 1}\frac{1}{a_{j'}\delta_{j'}^2}\right)\\ &= \max_{I\in\mathcal{J}_{r-1,r}\,,\,I'\in\mathcal{J}_{r,s}} \prod_{j\in(\{m\}\cup I\cup I')\,,\,j\geq 1}\frac{1}{a_j\delta_j^2}\\ &\leq \max_{J\in\mathcal{J}_{r,r+s}} \prod_{j\in J\,,\,j\geq 1}\frac{1}{a_j\delta_j^2} = T_{r,r+s}\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality above holds true in view of property (iii) of lemma 6. *Q.E.D.*

A.3 On the main Estimates of the "Purely Analytical" Part

Proof of lemma 8. We will prove by induction the upper bounds on the terms appearing in the Hamiltonian, as they are reported in formula (55). By the way, this will allow us to prove also the estimates (54) on the generating functions.

Let us assume that inequalities (55) are satisfied by replacing r with $r-1\geq 1$, i.e., (95)

$$\begin{aligned}&\|f_\ell^{(r-1,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}} \leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s-3+\ell}}{2^\ell}\,\frac{T_{r-1,s}^3}{\left(a_{r-1}\delta_{r-1}^2\right)^\ell}\,\nu_{r-1,s}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1}) && \text{for } 0\leq\ell\leq 2\,,\ s\geq r\,,\\ &\|f_\ell^{(r-1,0)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}} \leq \frac{\bar{E}}{2^\ell}\nu_{r-1,0} && \text{for } \ell\geq 3\,,\\ &\|f_\ell^{(r-1,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}} \leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s}}{2^\ell}\left(\frac{T_{r-1,s}}{a_m\delta_m^2}\right)^3\nu_{r-1,s}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1}) && \text{for } \ell\geq 3\,,\ s\geq 1\,,\\ &&& \quad m=\min\{r-1,s\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

We remark that for $r=1$, the upper bounds at point (e') of lemma 2 can be written as

$$\|f_\ell^{(0,s)}\|_{1-d_0} \leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s-3}}{2^\ell}\,T_{0,s}^3\,\nu_{0,s}\exp(s\zeta_0) \qquad \text{for } \ell\geq 0\,,\ s\geq 1\ , \tag{96}$$

where we used the definitions in formulæ (48)–(52). Actually, the inequality above is the starting point of the inductive argument and it slightly differs from (95), because in the r.h.s. of (96) there is not any divisor of type $a_m\delta_m^2$. Let us recall that in those denominators the index m cannot be equal to zero, because of the definitions in (6)

and (48). This fact will force us to somehow distinguish the special case $r = 1$ with respect to the general one.

Let us deal separately with the easy case with $s = 0$. Using the upper bounds at point (e') of lemma 2, the estimates in the second row of (55) can be immediately proved, because $f_\ell^{(r-1,0)} = f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,0)} = f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,0)} = f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,0)} = f_\ell^{(r,0)}$, $d_r \geq 0$ and $\nu_{r-1,0} = \nu_{r,0} = 1$ for $r \geq 1$, $\ell \geq 3$, as one can easily verify by looking at the recursive formulæ (13), (18), (23), (37), (48) and (52).

We consider the first stage of the r-th normalization step. By looking at formulæ (9)–(11) and using inequalities (6) and (95), we obtain

$$\|\chi_0^{(r)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}} \leq \frac{1}{a_r}\|f_0^{(r-1,r)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}} \leq M^{3r-3}\,\frac{T_{r-1,r}^3}{a_r}\,\nu_{r-1,r}\exp(r\zeta_{r-1})\ .$$

The upper bound on the generating function $\chi_0^{(r)}$ in formula (54) immediately follows from the inequality above and the definition in (50). In the inductive argument, let us recall that we must replace the estimate on $f_0^{(r-1,r)}$ in (95) with that on $f_0^{(0,1)}$ in (96); nevertheless, also in the case with $r = 1$, the estimate for $\chi_0^{(1)}$ in formula (54) can be easily justified in the same way as before.

We now aim to prove the following estimates on the terms appearing in the expansion (12) of the Hamiltonian $H^{(\mathrm{I};r)}$:

(97)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\|f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} \leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s-3+\ell}}{2^\ell}\,\frac{T_{r,s}^3}{\left(a_r\delta_r^2\right)^\ell}\,\nu_{r,s}^{(\mathrm{I})}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1}) && \text{for } 0 \leq \ell \leq 2\,,\ s \geq r\,,\\
&\|f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} \leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s}}{2^\ell}\left(\frac{T_{r,s}}{a_m\delta_m^2}\right)^3\nu_{r,s}^{(\mathrm{I})}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1}) && \text{for } \ell \geq 3\,,\ s \geq 1\,,\\
& && \quad m = \min\{r,s\}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

In formula above, we omitted the inequality $\|f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,0)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} \leq \bar{E}/2^\ell$ for $\ell \geq 3$, that has been already proved verifying the estimates in the second row of (55). In order to justify the inequalities in (97), we have to focus on the recursive definitions in (13). For $\ell = 0$ and $s = r$ we have nothing to do. When $\ell = 0$ and $r < s = r + m < 2r$, starting from the corresponding estimate in (95), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_0^{(\mathrm{I};r,r+m)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} &\leq \bar{E}M^{3(r+m)-3}\,T_{r-1,r+m}^3\,\nu_{r-1,r+m}\exp\left((r+m)\zeta_{r-1}\right)\\
&\leq \bar{E}M^{3(r+m)-3}\,T_{r,r+m}^3\,\nu_{r,r+m}^{(\mathrm{I})}\exp\left((r+m)\zeta_{r-1}\right)\ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

where we used property (i) of lemma 7 and the obvious inequality $\nu_{r-1,r+m} \leq \nu_{r,r+m}^{(\mathrm{I})}$.

Most of the work to verify the estimates (97) has to be done about the third definition in (13). There, it is convenient to consider separately the cases where s is a multiple of the normalization step r. Moreover, it is useful to introduce the sequence of non-negative integer numbers $\{w_\ell\}_{\ell\geq 0}$ defined as

$$w_\ell = 3 - \ell \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \ell \leq 2\ , \qquad w_\ell = 0 \quad \text{for } \ell \geq 3\ . \tag{99}$$

Thus, for $s = mr$ with $m \geq 2$ when $\ell = 0$ or $m \geq 1$ when $\ell \geq 1$, one has

(100)
$$\begin{aligned}\|f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,mr)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} &\leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3mr-w_\ell}}{2^\ell}\exp(mr\zeta_{r-1})\left\{M^{w_\ell-2m}\left(\frac{T^3_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^m \nu^m_{r-1,r}\nu_{r-1,0}\right.\\ &\left.+\sum_{j=0}^{m-1}\left[M^{w_\ell-2j-w_{\ell+2j}}\left(\frac{T^3_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^j\frac{T^3_{r-1,(m-j)r}}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2j}}}\,\nu^j_{r-1,r}\nu_{r-1,(m-j)r}\right]\right\}\\ &\leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3mr-w_\ell}}{2^\ell}\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,mr}\exp(mr\zeta_{r-1})\\ &\cdot\max\left\{\left(\frac{T^3_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^m,\ \max_{0\leq j\leq m-1}\left\{\left(\frac{T^3_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^j\frac{T^3_{r-1,(m-j)r}}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2j}}}\right\}\right\}\\ &\leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3mr-w_\ell}}{2^\ell}\,\frac{T^3_{r,mr}}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}}\,\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,mr}\exp(mr\zeta_{r-1})\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where we used lemma 3, the estimate for $\chi_0^{(1)}$ in formula (54), the inductive inequalities in (95), the fact that $\{a_r\delta_r^2\}_{r\geq 1}$ is a non-increasing sequence and $M\geq 1$ (recall the definitions in (6), (48) and (50)), some elementary properties† of the sequence $\{w_\ell\}_{\ell\geq 0}$, the definition of $\{\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 1\,,\,s\geq 0}$ in (52) and the inequality

$$\max\left\{\left(\frac{T^3_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^m,\ \max_{0\leq j\leq m-1}\left\{\left(\frac{T^3_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^j\frac{T^3_{r-1,(m-j)r}}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2j}}}\right\}\right\}\leq\frac{T^3_{r,mr}}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}}\tag{101}$$

holding true for $r\geq 1$, for $\ell=0$, $m\geq 2$ or $\ell\geq 1$, $m\geq 1$. By the way, concerning the starting point of the induction, let us remark that the inequality (100) holds true also for $r=1$, we just have to replace the first inductive estimate (95) with that in (96) and use the fact that $a_1\delta_1^2<1$. Thus, we now have to verify the inequality (101), so as to complete the justification of (100). For this purpose, once again, it is convenient to distinguish some sub-cases.

(i) For $m=1$ and, then, $\ell\geq 1$, inequality (101) is rather obvious, because $T_{r-1,r}\leq T_{r,r}$ (recall property (i) of lemma 7), $a_r\delta_r^2<1$ (see the definitions in (6) and (48)) and $3-w_\ell\geq 1$ for $\ell\geq 1$.

(ii) For $m\geq 2$ and, then, $\ell\geq 0$, it is convenient to separately verify that each term appearing in the l.h.s. of (101) is not greater than the one in the r.h.s., as we will do at the following points (ii.a) and (ii.b).

(ii.a) Concerning the first term in (101), we can write

$$\left(\frac{T^3_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^m\leq\left[\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^{m-1}T_{r,r}\right]^3\leq T^3_{r,mr}\leq\frac{T^3_{r,mr}}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}}\ ,$$

† Actually, we used two elementary inequalities: $w_\ell\leq 2m$ for $\ell=0$ and $m\geq 2$ or $\ell\geq 1$ and $m\geq 1$; $w_\ell\leq 2j+w_{\ell+2j}$ for $j\geq 0$. Both immediately follow from the definition in (99).

where we used lemma 7 and the elementary inequalities $3m-3 \geq m$ for $m \geq 2$, $a_r\delta_r^2 < 1$ and $3 - w_\ell \geq 0$ for $\ell \geq 0$.

(ii.b) For $j = 0, \ldots, m-1$, we can estimate the remaining terms of the l.h.s. of (101) as

$$\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}^3}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^j \frac{T_{r-1,(m-j)r}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2j}}} \leq \left[\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^j T_{r,(m-j)r}\right]^3 \frac{1}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-2j-w_{\ell+2j}}} \leq \frac{T_{r,mr}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}} ,$$

using again lemma 7, $a_r\delta_r^2 < 1$ and $w_\ell \leq 2j + w_{\ell+2j}$ for $j \geq 0$.

This complete the justification of (101) and, then, of (100).

Now, we still have to verify the estimates (97), starting from the third definition in (13) when s is not a multiple of the normalization step r. The case with $0 < s < r$ is trivial and can be treated in a similar way to (98). For $s > r$ let us put $m = \lfloor s/r \rfloor$ and $s = mr + i$; thus, we focus on the third definition in (13) with $0 < i < r$, for $m \geq 2$, $\ell = 0$ or $m \geq 1$, $\ell \geq 1$, for which we can write the following chain of inequalities

(102)
$$\begin{aligned}\|f_\ell^{(\mathrm{I};r,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} &\leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s-w_\ell}}{2^\ell}\nu_{r,s}^{(\mathrm{I})}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1})\max\left\{\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}^3}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^m \frac{T_{r-1,i}^3}{(a_i\delta_i^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2m}}},\right.\\ &\qquad \left.\max_{0\leq j\leq m-1}\left\{\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}^3}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^j \frac{T_{r-1,s-jr}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2j}}}\right\}\right\}\\ &\leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s-w_\ell}}{2^\ell}\,\frac{T_{r,s}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}}\,\nu_{r,s}^{(\mathrm{I})}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1}) ,\end{aligned}$$

where we proceeded in a similar way as for (100), replacing (101) by

(103)
$$\begin{aligned}&\max\left\{\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}^3}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^m \frac{T_{r-1,i}^3}{(a_i\delta_i^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2m}}},\right.\\ &\qquad \left.\max_{0\leq j\leq m-1}\left\{\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}^3}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^j \frac{T_{r-1,s-jr}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2j}}}\right\}\right\} \leq \frac{T_{r,s}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}} ,\end{aligned}$$

holding true for $\ell = 0$, $m \geq 2$ or $\ell \geq 1$, $m \geq 1$. Therefore, in order to complete the justification of (102), we now have to verify the inequality (103). For this purpose, it is convenient to separately verify that each term appearing in the l.h.s. of (103) is not greater than the one in the r.h.s. First, one can easily verify that

(104)
$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}^3}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^m \frac{T_{r-1,i}^3}{(a_i\delta_i^2)^{3-w_{\ell+2m}}} &\leq \left[T_{r-1,r}\left(\frac{T_{r-1,r}}{a_r\delta_r^2}\right)^{m-1}\frac{T_{r,i}}{a_i\delta_i^2}\right]^3 \frac{1}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-2m}}\\ &\leq \frac{T_{r,s}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}}\,\frac{1}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{w_\ell-2m}} \leq \frac{T_{r,s}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^{3-w_\ell}} ,\end{aligned}$$

where we used lemma 7, $a_r\delta_r^2 < 1$ and $w_\ell \leq 2m$, both for $\ell = 0$, $m \geq 2$ and $\ell \geq 1$, $m \geq 1$. For $j = 0, \ldots, m-1$, we can estimate the remaining terms of the l.h.s. of (103) in a similar way to (104). This concludes the justification of inequalities (103), therefore also estimates (102) and (97) are completely verified.

Let us now consider the second stage of the r-th normalization step. After having recalled formulæ (14)–(16), one can easily justify the upper bound on the generating function $\chi_1^{(r)}$ in formula (54), by using inequalities (6) and (97) and the definition in (50). Let us remark that the upper bounds in (97) play now the role of inductive estimates and they also include the case $r = 1$, which allows starting the induction. For what concerns the functions $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{II};r,s)}$ appearing in the expansion of $H^{(\mathrm{II};r)}$, we can prove analogous estimates to those in (97), just replacing the upper index I with II. This can be verified, by starting from the recursive definitions in (18) and by patiently handling with many different cases in a similar way to what we have done for (97).

For what concerns the first part of the third stage of the r-th normalization step, the upper bound on the generating function $\chi_2^{(r)}$ in (54) can be proved in a similar way to that for $\chi_0^{(r)}$. By patiently estimating all terms appearing in the recursive definitions in (23), we can provide the upper bounds

(105)

$$\|f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-3\delta_r} \leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s-3+\ell}}{2^\ell}\,\frac{T_{r,s}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^\ell}\,\nu_{r,s}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1}) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \ell \leq 2\,,\ s \geq r\,,$$

$$\|f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};r,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-3\delta_r} \leq \frac{\bar{E}M^{3s}}{2^\ell}\left(\frac{T_{r,s}}{a_m\delta_m^2}\right)^3\nu_{r,s}\exp(s\zeta_{r-1}) \quad \text{for } \ell \geq 3\,,\ s \geq 1\,, \text{ with } m = \min\{r,s\}\,.$$

Since all the estimates concerning both the second stage and the first part of the third stage of the r-th normalization step are similar to the ones considered in the first stage, we omit all the tedious calculations necessary to fully justify (105).

Let us now focus on the terms generated by the diagonalization of the quadratic normal form part of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^r)$. For $r = 1$, since $f_2^{(\mathrm{III};1,1)} = 0$ (see (39)), then equations (25)–(32) imply that $\mathcal{D}_2^{(1;j)} = 0$ for $j \geq 1$; therefore, $f_\ell^{(\mathrm{III};1,s)} = f_\ell^{(1,s)}$ for $0 \leq \ell \leq 2$, $s > 1$ or $\ell \geq 3$, $s \geq 0$, in view of the definitions in (37). Therefore, for what concerns the first normalization step, the upper bounds in (55) immediately follow from those in (105) and the fact that $\zeta_0 = \zeta_1 = 0$ (see (51)). Let us now consider the generic case with $r \geq 2$. Comparing formulæ (7) and (25)–(28) with the hypotheses of lemma 4, one immediately realizes that the smallness condition

$$\varepsilon_{\mathrm{diag}}^\star = \varepsilon^{r-1}\left(\frac{2e^2}{\delta_r^2} + \frac{2^9}{(1-d_{r-1}-3\delta_r)^2}\right)\frac{\|f_2^{(\mathrm{III};r,r)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r}}{b_r\,R^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}\,,$$

must be satisfied. Actually, the stronger inequality $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{diag}}^\star \leq 2^{-(r+6)}$ holds true, as it can be checked by using (53), (105) and the definitions in (6), (48), (50). The inequality bounding the effect of the operator $\mathcal{E}_j^{(r)}$ in formula (54) is nothing but the first estimate

in (44) with $\varepsilon^\star_{\rm diag} = 2^{-(r+6)}$. Applying lemma 4 to the third equation in (37), we obtain

$$\|f_\ell^{(r,s)}\|_{1-d_r} \leq \|f_\ell^{({\rm III};r,s)}\|_{1-d_{r-1}-\delta_r} \, \exp\left(\frac{2^{-(r+6)}}{1-2^{-(r+6)}}\right) \, ,$$

for $0 \leq \ell \leq 2$, $s > r \geq 2$ or $\ell \geq 3$, $s \geq 1$. Starting from the estimates in (105), using inequality above and the definition in (51) one can complete the justification of (55). Recall that we have already considered the case $s = 0$ at the beginning of the proof.

In order to complete the proof of the lemma, we have to evaluate the variations of the frequencies induced by the r-th normalization step. Starting from equation (35), using (48), (105) and the first Cauchy inequality in (81), we obtain

$$\max_{1\leq j\leq n_1} |\omega_j^{(r)} - \omega_j^{(r-1)}| \leq \varepsilon^r \frac{\bar{E}}{3\,\varrho} M^{3r-1} \frac{T_{r,s}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^2} \nu_{r,r} \exp(r\zeta_{r-1}) \, . \tag{106}$$

Analogously, starting from (36), using (48), (51), (105), the second estimate (again with $\varepsilon^\star_{\rm diag} = 2^{-(r+6)}$) in (44) and twice the second Cauchy inequality in (81), we get

$$\max_{1\leq j\leq n_2} |\Omega_j^{(r)} - \Omega_j^{(r-1)}| \leq \varepsilon^{r-1} \frac{8\,\bar{E}}{9\,R^2} M^{3r-1} \frac{T_{r,s}^3}{(a_r\delta_r^2)^2} \nu_{r,r} \exp(r\zeta_r) \, . \tag{107}$$

By using inequality $a_r\delta_r^2 < 1$ and the definition in (50), one can easily verify that both the estimates (106) and (107) are gathered in (56). *Q.E.D.*

A.4 Estimates of some special numerical sequences

We report here the proofs of lemmas 9–10.

Proof of lemma 9. Since $a_s\delta_s^2 < 1$ (see (6) and (48)), it is enough to prove the second part of the inequality stated in the lemma, i.e., $T_{r,s}/(a_s\delta_s^2) \leq A^s e^{s\Gamma}$ for $r \geq 1$, $s \geq 1$. Starting from the definition in (49), using properties (i) and (ii) of lemma 6, the selection rule S and the fact that the sequence $\{a_s\delta_s^2\}_{s\geq 1}$ is decreasing, we get

$$\frac{T_{r,s}}{a_s\delta_s^2} = \frac{1}{a_s\delta_s^2} \max_{I\in\mathcal{J}_{s,s}} \prod_{j\in I\,,\,j\geq 1} \frac{1}{a_j\delta_j^2} \leq \prod_{j\in\{s\}\cup I_s^*\,,\,j\geq 1} \frac{1}{a_j\delta_j^2} \, .$$

It is convenient to evaluate the logarithm of $T_{r,s}/(a_s\delta_s^2)$; thus, starting from the estimate above, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\frac{T_{r,s}}{a_s\delta_s^2} &\leq -\log(a_s\delta_s^2) - \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor s/2\rfloor} \left(\left\lfloor\frac{s}{k}\right\rfloor - \left\lfloor\frac{s}{k+1}\right\rfloor\right) \log(a_k\delta_k^2) \\
&\leq -\sum_{k=1}^{s} \left(\left\lfloor\frac{s}{k}\right\rfloor - \left\lfloor\frac{s}{k+1}\right\rfloor\right) (\log a_k + 2\log\delta_k) \qquad (108) \\
&\leq -s\sum_{k\geq 1} \frac{\log a_k + 2\log\delta_k}{k(k+1)} = s\left(\Gamma - \sum_{k\geq 1} \frac{2\log\delta_k}{k(k+1)}\right) \, ,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used properties (i) and (ii) of lemma 5, the fact that the sequence $\{a_s\delta_s^2\}_{s\geq 1}$ is decreasing and the condition $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ in (57). Thus, using (48), one can easily get

$$\begin{aligned}-\sum_{k\geq 1}\frac{2\log\delta_k}{k(k+1)} &= 2\sum_{k\geq 1}\frac{\log\frac{8\pi^2}{3}+2\log k}{k(k+1)}\\ &< 2\log\frac{8\pi^2}{3}+4\left(\frac{\log 2}{6}+\int_2^\infty\frac{\log x\,\mathrm{d}x}{x^2}\right)\\ &< 15\log 2\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where we explicitly used the relation $\sum_{k\geq 1}1/[k(k+1)]=1$. Replacing the estimate above into (108), we conclude the proof. *Q.E.D.*

Proof of lemma 10. First, it is convenient to replace the definition in (52) for the sequence $\{\nu_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 0\,,\,s\geq 0}$ with a closed formula, avoiding to introduce $\{\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 1\,,\,s\geq 0}$ and $\{\nu^{(\mathrm{II})}_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 1\,,\,s\geq 0}$. Thus, let us remove the symbol $\nu^{(\mathrm{II})}$, by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{r,s} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}\left(\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r}+\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r}\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,0}\right)^j\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor-j}(\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r})^i\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s-(i+j)r} = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}(2\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r})^j\sum_{i=j}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}(\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r})^{i-j}\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s-ir}\\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}(\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r})^i\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s-ir}\sum_{j=0}^{i}2^j = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}\left(2^{i+1}-1\right)(\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,r})^i\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}_{r,s-ir}\ .\end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we can eliminate the occurrence of $\nu^{(\mathrm{I})}$, by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{r,s} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}2^j\left(2^{j+1}-1\right)\nu^j_{r-1,r}\sum_{i=j}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}\nu^{i-j}_{r-1,r}\nu_{r-1,s-ir}\\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}\nu^i_{r-1,r}\nu_{r-1,s-jr}\sum_{j=0}^{i}\left(2^{2j+1}-2^j\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}\theta_i\nu^i_{r-1,r}\nu_{r-1,s-ir}\ ,\end{aligned}\tag{109}$$

where we introduced the shorthand notation

$$\theta_i=\sum_{j=0}^{i}\left(2^{2j+1}-2^j\right)=\frac{2}{3}\left(2^{2(i+1)}-1\right)-2^{i+1}+1\ .$$

From the definition above we can immediately verify that

$$\theta_0=1\ ,\qquad \theta_1=7\ ,\qquad \frac{1}{3}2^{2(j+1)}\leq\theta_j\leq\frac{2}{3}2^{2(j+1)}\ \text{ for } j\geq 1\ .\tag{110}$$

Using such basic properties of the sequence $\{\theta_j\}_{j\geq 0}$, one can easily gets

$$\theta_{j+1}\leq 8\theta_j\qquad\text{for } j\geq 0\ .\tag{111}$$

Let us recall that combining (52) with the recursive equation (109), we can provide

a new and more compact definition of the sequence $\{\nu_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 0\,,\,s\geq 0}$, as

$$\nu_{0,s}=1 \quad \text{for } s\geq 0\ , \qquad \nu_{r,s}=\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor}\theta_j\nu_{r-1,r}^j\nu_{r-1,s-jr} \quad \text{for } r\geq 1\,,\ s\geq 0\ . \tag{112}$$

As an immediate consequence, we remark that

$$\nu_{0,s}\leq \nu_{1,s}\leq \ldots \leq \nu_{s,s}=\nu_{s+1,s}=\ldots\ . \tag{113}$$

Moreover, since $\nu_{r,r}=\theta_0\nu_{r-1,r}+\theta_1\nu_{r-1,r}$, $\theta_0=1$ and $\theta_1=7$ we have

$$\nu_{r,r}=8\nu_{r-1,r} \qquad \text{for } r\geq 1\ . \tag{114}$$

The following chains of inequalities allow us to justify other useful properties of the sequence $\{\nu_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 0\,,\,s\geq 0}$. Indeed, starting from (112), for $r\geq 2\,,\ s>r$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{r,s}&=\nu_{r-1,s}+\nu_{r-1,r}\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor-1}\theta_{j+1}\nu_{r-1,r}^j\nu_{r-1,s-r-jr}\\ &\leq \nu_{r-1,s}+8\nu_{r-1,r}\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor s/r\rfloor-1}\theta_j\nu_{r-1,r}^j\nu_{r-1,s-r-jr}\\ &\leq \nu_{r-1,s}+8\nu_{r-1,r}\nu_{r-1,s-r}\leq \nu_{r-1,s}+\nu_{r,r}\nu_{s-r,s-r}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

where we used inequality (111) and equation (114). In a similar way, for $r=1$ (and, again, $s>r$) we can provide a more accurate estimate, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{1,s}&=\nu_{0,s}+\nu_{0,1}\sum_{j=0}^{s-1}\theta_{j+1}\nu_{0,1}^j\nu_{0,s-1-j}\\ &\leq (1+\theta_1)\nu_{0,s-1}+8\sum_{j=1}^{s-1}\theta_j\nu_{0,1}^j\nu_{0,s-1-j}\leq 8\nu_{0,s-1}\leq \nu_{s-1,s-1}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

where some particular values of the sequences involved have been inserted (namely, $\theta_1=7$ and $\nu_{0,s}=1$ for $s\geq 0$). We aim to control all the sequence $\{\nu_{r,s}\}_{r\geq 0\,,\,s\geq 0}$; thus, looking at formula (113) one immediately realizes that it is enough to provide an upper bound on the diagonal elements, for which we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{r,r}&=8\nu_{r-1,r}\leq 8\nu_{r-2,r}+8\nu_{r-1,r-1}\nu_{1,1}\leq\ldots\\ &\leq 8\nu_{1,r}+8\left(\nu_{2,2}\nu_{r-2,r-2}+\ldots+\nu_{r-1,r-1}\nu_{1,1}\right)\leq 8\sum_{j=1}^{r-1}\nu_{j,j}\nu_{r-j,r-j}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

for $r\geq 2$, where we orderly used all the properties described by formulæ (114)–(116).

Using the fact that $\nu_{1,1}=8$ (see (112) and (114)) and the recursive inequality for the diagonal elements in (117), by induction one can easily verify that

$$\nu_{r,r}\leq \frac{64^r}{8}\lambda_r \qquad \text{for } r\geq 1\ ,$$

being $\{\lambda_r\}_{r\geq 1}$ the Catalan sequence, whose definition is recalled in (93). By combining the information provided by formula (113), the inequality above and the well known upper bound $\lambda_r \leq 4^{r-1}$, one can fully justify the statement. *Q.E.D.*

A.5 On the Geometry of the Resonant Regions

Proof of proposition 2. The proof proceeds by induction. However, in order to highlight the key points, we first describe in detail the first two steps. By hypotheses, $\Omega^{(0)}(\omega)$ is an analytic function on the complex extended domain $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}$ and its Jacobian is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}$, namely $\left|\partial\Omega^{(0)}/\partial\omega\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}} \leq J_0$, where $\left|\cdot\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}}$ is defined in (42). Thus, starting from the inequality at point (a') of lemma 2, if h_0 is so small that

$$h_0 \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{K+2J_0\varepsilon}\frac{\gamma}{2K^\tau}\cdot\frac{\bar{b}}{4J_0}\right\}\ , \tag{118}$$

then the non-resonance conditions (6) and (7) are satisfied in the complexified domain $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}_{h_0}$ for $0<|k|\leq K$, $|l|\leq 2$ and $0\leq i<j\leq n_2$. More precisely,

$$\left|k\cdot\omega+\varepsilon l\ \cdot\Omega^{(0)}(\omega)\right|\geq\frac{(2-1/2)\gamma}{K^\tau}\quad\text{and}\quad\left|\Omega^{(0)}_i(\omega)-\Omega^{(0)}_j(\omega)\right|\geq\left(2-\frac{1}{2}\right)\bar{b}\ . \tag{119}$$

For $r=0$, the inequalities in (73) immediately follow from the the previous ones, recalling that $\varphi^{(0)}=\mathrm{Id}$. Moreover, the frequencies are not modified by the first normalization step (see (38)), therefore we set

$$\mathcal{W}^{(1)}=\mathcal{W}^{(0)}\quad\text{and}\quad J_1=J_0\ .$$

Let us now require the new radius of the complex extension be so small that

$$h_1\leq\min\left\{h_0\,,\ \frac{1}{\max\{K\,,\,1/\sigma\}+\varepsilon J_1}\cdot\frac{\gamma}{4(2K)^\tau}\right\}\ . \tag{120}$$

Using condition above and the first non-resonant condition in (a') of lemma 2, the first inequality in (119) is replaced by

$$\left|k\cdot\omega+\varepsilon l\ \cdot\Omega^{(1)}(\omega)\right|\geq\frac{(2-1/2)\gamma}{(2K)^\tau}\ , \tag{121}$$

for $\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1}$, $0<|k|\leq 2K$ and $|l|\leq 2$. This concludes the proof in the case $r=1$.

The first actual change of the frequencies might occurs at the end of the second perturbation step and the transformed fast frequencies reads

$$\omega^{(2)}(\omega^{(0)})=\omega^{(2)}(\omega^{(1)})=\omega^{(1)}+\delta\omega^{(2)}(\omega^{(1)})=\left(\mathrm{Id}+\delta\omega^{(2)}\right)(\omega^{(1)})$$

where $\max_{1\leq j\leq n_1}\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1}}\left|\delta\omega^{(2)}_j(\omega)\right|\leq\sigma\left(\varepsilon\mathcal{A}\right)^2$ in view of the assumption in (71). If

$$\mu_1=\frac{4\sigma(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^2}{h_1}<1\ , \tag{122}$$

in view of lemma D.1 in [17], the function $(\mathrm{Id} + \delta\omega^{(2)})$ admits an analytic inverse $\varphi^{(2)} : \mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4} \to \mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/2}$ and, in the domain $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}$, the following estimates hold true

$$\max_{1\le j\le n_2} \sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}} \left|\varphi^{(2)}_j(\omega) - \omega_j\right| \le \sigma(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^2 \ , \qquad \left|\frac{\partial\left(\varphi^{(2)} - \mathrm{Id}\right)}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}} \le \mu_1 \ , \tag{123}$$

where the norm $\left|\cdot\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}}$ on the Jacobian of the function $\varphi^{(2)} - \mathrm{Id} : \mathcal{W}_{h_1/4} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_1}$ is defined in an analogous way to (42). The growth of the Lipschitz constants for the sequence of functions $\left\{\varphi^{(r)} - \mathrm{Id}\right\}_{r\ge 0}$ is controlled by setting

$$\bar{J}_0 = \bar{J}_1 = 0 \ , \qquad \bar{J}_2 = e^{\mu_1} - 1 \ , \tag{124}$$

so that, in particular, we have $\left|\partial\left(\varphi^{(2)} - \mathrm{Id}\right)/\partial\omega\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}} \le \bar{J}_2$.

Recall now that the step $r = 2$ includes also the preparation of the next step $r = 3$, namely cutting out the resonant regions

$$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}_{k,l} = \left\{\omega \in \mathcal{W}^{(2)} : \left|k\cdot\omega + \varepsilon l\ \cdot\Omega^{(2)}\circ\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\right| \le 2\gamma/(3K)^\tau\right\} \ .$$

Thus we need an upper bound on both the sup-norm of $\Omega^{(2)}\circ\varphi^{(2)}$ and the Lipschitz constant of its Jacobian. The new transversal frequencies can be written as

$$\varepsilon\Omega^{(2)}(\omega^{(1)}) = \varepsilon\Omega^{(1)}(\omega^{(1)}) + \varepsilon\Delta\Omega^{(2)}(\omega^{(1)}) \ ,$$

where we have $\max_{1\le j\le n_1}\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1}}\left|\varepsilon\Delta\Omega^{(2)}_j(\omega)\right| \le (\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^2$, in view of the hypothesis in (71). Moreover, in the domain $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}$ the new transversal frequencies are functions of the transformed fast frequencies, namely

$$\Omega^{(2)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega^{(2)})\big) = \Omega^{(1)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega^{(2)})\big) + \Delta\Omega^{(2)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega^{(2)})\big) \ . \tag{125}$$

Using this formula we can bound the Jacobian of the function $\Omega^{(2)}\circ\varphi^{(2)}$. To this end, we need the preliminary estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{\partial\big(\Omega^{(2)}\circ\varphi^{(2)} - \Omega^{(1)}\big)}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}} &\le \left|\frac{\partial\Omega^{(1)}}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/2}} \left|\frac{\partial\big(\varphi^{(2)} - \mathrm{Id}\big)}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}} \\ &\quad + \left|\frac{\partial\Delta\Omega^{(2)}}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/2}} \left|\frac{\partial\varphi^{(2)}}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}} \\ &\le J_1\mu_1 + \frac{2(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^2}{\varepsilon h_1}(1+\mu_1) \le J_1\mu_1 + \frac{\mu_1}{2\varepsilon\sigma}(1+\mu_1) \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where we used formulæ (122)–(123), the estimate $\left|\partial\Omega^{(1)}/\partial\omega\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/2}} \le J_1$ and Cauchy inequality to estimate $\left|\partial\Delta\Omega^{(2)}/\partial\omega\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/2}}$. Thus, we can ensure that the Jacobian of

the transformed transversal frequencies is bounded as

$$\left|\frac{\partial\big(\Omega^{(2)}\circ\varphi^{(2)}\big)}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}} \leq \left(J_1+\frac{\mu_1}{2\varepsilon\sigma}\right)(1+\mu_1) =: J_2\ . \tag{126}$$

Using again formula (125), we can bound the deterioration of the non-resonance conditions involving the transversal frequencies. In fact, for $l\in\mathbb{Z}^{n_2}$, $|l|\leq 2$, we have

(127)
$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}}\left|\varepsilon l\cdot\left[\Omega^{(2)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)-\Omega^{(1)}(\omega)\right]\right| \\
&\quad\leq 2\varepsilon\max_j\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}}\left|\Omega^{(1)}_j\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)-\Omega^{(1)}_j(\omega)\right|+2\max_j\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}}\left|\varepsilon\Delta\Omega^{(2)}_j\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)\right| \\
&\quad\leq 2\left|\varepsilon\frac{\partial\Omega^{(1)}}{\partial\omega}\right|_{\infty;\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/2}}\max_j\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}}\left|\varphi^{(2)}_j(\omega)-\omega_j\right|+2\max_j\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/2}}\left|\varepsilon\Delta\Omega^{(2)}_j(\omega)\right| \\
&\quad\leq 2\varepsilon J_1\sigma(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^2+2(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^2=2(1+\varepsilon J_1\sigma)(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^2=\mu_1\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}+\varepsilon J_1\right)\frac{h_1}{2}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}$, $0<|k|\leq 2K$ and $|l|\leq 2$, we obtain the non-resonance estimate

(128)
$$\begin{aligned}
\left|k\cdot\omega+\varepsilon l\ \cdot\Omega^{(2)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)\right| &\geq \frac{(2-1/2)\gamma}{(2K)^\tau}-\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}}\left|\varepsilon l\cdot\left[\Omega^{(2)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)-\Omega^{(1)}(\omega)\right]\right| \\
&\geq \frac{(2-1/2)\gamma}{(2K)^\tau}-\mu_1\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}+\varepsilon J_1\right)\frac{h_1}{2}\geq\frac{(2-1/2-1/4)\gamma}{(2K)^\tau}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where we started from inequality (121) (holding true on all the complex domain $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}$), we used (127), (122) and the definition of h_1 in (120). Moreover, requiring also

$$\varepsilon\mathcal{A}\leq\frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon J_1\sigma)\mathcal{A}}\,\frac{\bar b}{8}\ , \tag{129}$$

one can easily obtain the lower bound

$$\left|\Omega^{(2)}_i\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)-\Omega^{(2)}_j\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)\right|\geq\left(2-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{4}\right)\bar b \tag{130}$$

uniformly with respect to $\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}$, when $i\neq j$. It is now time to consider the new subset of resonant regions $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}_{k,l}$ for $2K<|k|\leq 3K$, $|l|\leq 2$. First, we remove them from the domain, by defining $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$ according to (67)–(68). Having required that the new radius of the complex extension is so small that

$$h_2\leq\min\left\{\frac{h_1}{4}\ ,\ \frac{1}{\max\{3K/2\,,\,1/\sigma\}+\varepsilon J_2}\,\frac{\gamma}{8(3K)^\tau}\right\}\ , \tag{131}$$

for $2K < |k| \le 3K$, $|l| \le 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(2)}_{h_2}} \left|k\cdot\omega+\varepsilon l\cdot\Omega^{(2)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)\right| &\ge \inf_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(2)}} \left|k\cdot\omega+\varepsilon l\cdot\Omega^{(2)}\big(\varphi^{(2)}(\omega)\big)\right| \\ &\quad - 3Kh_2 - 2\varepsilon J_2 h_2 \ge \frac{(2-1/2-1/4)\gamma}{(3K)^\tau}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

Here we used the definitions (67)–(68) for the real set $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$ and subtract the contribution due to the complex extension; moreover, we also used formulæ (131), (126) (recall that $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}_{h_2} \subseteq \mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{h_1/4}$, in view of (67) and (131)). The inequalities in (73) are easily justified in view of (128), (130) and (132); This concludes the proof of the statement for $r = 2$.

Iterating the procedure for a generic step $r > 2$ it is now straightforward, provided the sequence of restriction of the frequency domain is suitably selected. Let us give some details. For $r > 2$, we restart from the relation

$$\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)}) = \omega^{(r)}\circ\varphi^{(r-1)}\circ\omega^{(r-1)}(\omega^{(0)}) = \Big(\mathrm{Id}+\delta\omega^{(r)}\Big)\big(\omega^{(r-1)}(\omega^{(0)})\big)\ ,$$

where $\max_{1\le j\le n_1}\sup_{\omega\in\mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}}}\big\{\big|\delta\omega^{(r)}_j(\omega)\big|\big\} \le \sigma\big(\varepsilon\mathcal{A}\big)^r$ in view of assumption (71). Thus, using again lemma D.1 in [17], we obtain $\omega^{(r-1)}(\omega^{(0)})$ from $\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})$ via the function $\phi^{(r)} : \mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}/4} \to \mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}/2}$. The function $\varphi^{(r)}$, namely the inverse of $\omega^{(r)}(\omega^{(0)})$, is obtained by composition, i.e., $\varphi^{(r)} = \varphi^{(r-1)}\circ\phi^{(r)} = \phi^{(2)}\circ\ldots\circ\phi^{(r)}$ and, by construction, we have $\varphi^{(r)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}/4}\big) \subset \varphi^{(r-1)}\big(\mathcal{W}^{(r-1)}_{h_{r-1}}\big)$. Replacing $\varphi^{(2)}$ with $\phi^{(r)}$, formulæ (122)–(132) can be suitably adapted to the case $r > 2$, so as to prove the inequalities corresponding to (128), (130) and (132). For this purpose, for $r \ge 2$, it is convenient to impose the following conditions

(i) $$\mu_{r-1} = \frac{4\sigma(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^r}{h_{r-1}} \le \frac{\min\big\{1\,,\,\varepsilon\sigma\big\}}{2^r}\ ,$$

(ii) $$\bar J_r = \bar J_{r-1}(1+\mu_{r-1}) + \mu_{r-1} \le e^{\tilde\mu_1} - 1 \le \varepsilon\sigma\ ,$$

(iii) $$J_r = \Big(J_{r-1} + \frac{\mu_{r-1}}{2\varepsilon\sigma}\Big)(1+\mu_{r-1}) \le \Big(J_0 + \frac{\tilde\mu_1}{2\varepsilon\sigma}\Big)e^{\tilde\mu_1} \le 2J_0 + 1\ ,$$

(iv) $$(\varepsilon\mathcal{A})^{r-1} \le \frac{\bar b}{2^{r+1}\mathcal{A}(1+\varepsilon J_{r-1}\sigma)}\ ,$$

(v) $$h_r \le \min\left\{\frac{h_{r-1}}{4}\,,\ \frac{1}{\max\big\{\frac{(r+1)K}{2}\,,\,\frac{1}{\sigma}\big\}+\varepsilon J_r}\,\frac{\gamma}{2^{r+1}\big((r+1)K\big)^\tau}\right\}\ ,$$

where $\tilde\mu_r = \sum_{s=r}^\infty \mu_s$. Let us remark that the estimates (ii)–(iii) are straightforward consequences of condition (i). The sequence $\{h_r\}_{r\ge0}$ in (70) has been chosen so as to satisfy all the smallness conditions (118), (120) and (v), which are required along this proof. This is seen because $\varepsilon J_r\sigma \le \varepsilon(2J_0+1)\sigma < 1$ in view of point (iii), hypothesis $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^*_{\rm ge}$ and $\varepsilon^*_{\rm ge} \le 1/[(2J_0+1)\sigma]$ due to (72).

The smallness conditions (122), (129), (i) and (iv) on ε are satisfied in view of definition (72) since $\varepsilon < \varepsilon^*_{\rm ge}$. This concludes the proof. *Q.E.D.*

Acknowledgements. A. G. and U. L. have been partially supported by the research program "Teorie geometriche e analitiche dei sistemi Hamiltoniani in dimensioni finite e infinite", PRIN 2010JJ4KPA_009, financed by MIUR. The work of M. S. is supported by an FSR Incoming Post-doctoral Fellowship of the Académie universitaire Louvain, co-funded by the Marie Curie Actions of the European Commission.

References

[1] M. Berti and L. Biasco: *Branching of Cantor manifolds of elliptic tori and applications to PDEs*, Commun. Math. Phys., **305**, 741–796 (2011).

[2] L. Biasco, L. Chierchia and E. Valdinoci: *Elliptic two-dimensional invariant tori for the planetary three-body problem*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **170**, 91–135 (2003).

[3] L. Biasco, L. Chierchia and E. Valdinoci: *N-dimensional elliptic invariant tori for the planar (N+1)-body problem*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **37**, n.5, 1560–1588 (2006).

[4] L.H. Eliasson: *Perturbations of stable invariant tori for Hamiltonian systems*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, Cl. Sci., IV Serie, **15**, 115–147 (1988).

[5] A. Giorgilli: *Notes on exponential stability of Hamiltonian systems*, in *Dynamical Systems, Part I*. Pubbl. Cent. Ric. Mat. Ennio De Giorgi, Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa, 87–198 (2003).

[6] Giorgilli, A. and Locatelli, U., *Kolmogorov theorem and classical perturbation theory*, J. of App. Math. and Phys. (ZAMP), **48**, 220–261 (1997).

[7] A. Giorgilli and U. Locatelli: *On classical series expansion for quasi-periodic motions*, MPEJ, **3**, n.5, 1–25 (1997).

[8] A. Giorgilli and S. Marmi: *Convergence radius in the Poincaré-Siegel problem*, DCDS Series S, **3**, 601–621 (2010).

[9] Gröbner, W.: *Die Lie-Reihen und Ihre Anwendungen*, Springer Verlag, Berlin (1960); Italian transl.: *Le serie di Lie e le loro applicazioni*, Cremonese, Roma (1973).

[10] W.H. Jefferys and J. Moser: *Quasi-periodic solutions for the three-body problem*, Astronom. J., **71**, 568–578 (1966).

[11] A.N. Kolmogorov: *Preservation of conditionally periodic movements with small change in the Hamilton function*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **98**, 527–530 (1954). English transl. in: Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory translation LA-TR-71-67.

[12] S.B. Kuksin: *The perturbation theory for the quasi-periodic solutions of infinite-dimensional Hamiltonian systems and its applications to the Korteweg de Vries equation*, Matem. Sbornik **136** (1988); English transl. in: Math. USSR Sbornik **64**, 397–413 (1989).

[13] J. Laskar: *Systèmes de variables et éléments*, in D. Benest, C. Froeschlé (eds.), *Les Méthodes modernes de la Mécanique Céleste (Goutelas 89)*, 63–87 (1989).

[14] B.B. Lieberman: *Existence of quasi-periodic solutions to the three-body problem*, Celestial Mechanics, **3**, 408–426 (1971).

[15] U. Locatelli and A. Giorgilli: *Invariant tori in the secular motions of the three–body planetary systems*, Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astr., **78**, 47–74 (2000).

[16] V.K. Melnikov: *On some cases of conservation of almost periodic motions with a small change of the Hamiltonian function*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **165**, 1245–1248 (1965).

[17] J. Pöschel: *On elliptic lower dimensional tori in Hamiltonian systems*, Math. Z., **202**, 559–608 (1989).

[18] J. Pöschel: *A KAM-theorem for some nonlinear PDEs*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci., **23**, 119–148 (1996).

[19] M. Sansottera, U. Locatelli and A. Giorgilli: *A semi-analytic algorithm for constructing lower dimensional elliptic tori in planetary systems*, Celest. Mech. Dyn. Astr., **111**, 337–361 (2011).